

Appendix F
Public Comments after Final Public Meeting
May 22, 2013

Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone
Feasibility Study

This page intentionally left blank.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 1

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Michael Blommer
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Blommer
1233 33rd St NW
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail: mjblommer@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 04/19/2013 Date Received: 04/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have been rowing on the Potomac river for over four years now. These are some of my favorite memories I have taken from my time here in Washington, DC. The Potomac river truly is a gem of the city, and nothing makes me happier than seeing many crews out training any given afternoon. The sport is growing rapidly, I can see this every day as the number of high schools competing for time on the dock seems to grow every day. Some crews have to store their shells hundreds of yards away from the dock, almost in the parking lot of TBC. It seems TBC is bursting at the seams with shells and crews and this is becoming a bottleneck for the sports expansion. Rowing is a sport that teaches extreme discipline, teamwork, and gets many students out and active. I completely support the high density plan to build up the NMBZ, simply because programs desperately need more space to grow. I spend almost every morning on the river, and despite lacking the ecological knowledge of site A, sites B through E would only benefit from development. Currently site E is an eyesore, a flat tarmac surrounded by chain linked fence. By allowing development, this currently unusable space would be transformed into a beautiful addition to the already great waterfront park while also allowing the most potential for growth of high school and university crews. To me, the low density plan seems to add little value to the area, yet takes much away from the natural state of the space. I see many other cities embracing rowing and the subsequent construction of boathouses, yet here in the nation's capital with an absolute gem of a river, the development and growth of a boathouse district is constantly shut down. I agree many restrictions must be placed on what can be built. I point to the NPS's own TBC as an example of the wrong way to build a boathouse. Plans submitted in the past by Georgetown University take extreme pride in the construction and looks of the new structure, and would definitely be a step up from the style of TBC. The NPS has pushed back the process for too long. It is time to take some action and get the NMBZ developed. I am hopeful that when my children begin rowing in the near future, they will have a facility as beautiful as the Potomac itself to train from.

Michael Blommer

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 2

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: David Cottingham
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2914 Kanawha St NW
Washington, DC 20015
USA
E-mail: david.cottingham@starpower.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 04/28/2013 Date Received: 04/28/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a frequent user of the Georgetown waterfront area as bicycle commuter (twice daily, year round, 80% of work days) and kayak paddler (30+ times a year). I have 2 daughters who rowed crew for their high school. So I am very familiar with current use patterns of the area both on the water and the streets.

I support the low density development options for many reasons:

- 1) the area cannot accommodate additional traffic: it is currently very dangerous almost every afternoon as I commute home on the CCT. School buses try to turn around in a very narrow street. Cars who have no idea they are reaching a dead end have to turn around north of the Potomac Boat Club.
- 2) there should be no additional buildings upstream of Washington Canoe Club. Building one or more would only exacerbate the conditions for cyclists and recreational users of CCT. It would also impair the historic qualities of C&O Canal NHP.
- 3) there is adequate space in zone C to provide much needed for team rowing facilities at a public or community boat facility.
- 4) NPS should be required to build publicly-accessible rest rooms for visitors to new facilities as well as Georgetown Waterfront Park. It is inexcusable that NPS spent all that money to build the new waterfront park and yet provides no rest room facilities there for all the visitors. Nearby commercial establishments all have signs up that rest rooms are only for patrons.

thank you. Please keep me apprised of next steps in this process.

David Cottingham
Washington, DC

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 3

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Helen L. Shaw
Organization: C&O Canal Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8721 Burning Tree Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
USA
E-mail: heldonshaw@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/04/2013 Date Received: 05/04/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The "Low Density" scenario is the only one of three described in the study that protects the natural, historic and cultural resources of the C&O Canal NHPark while providing new boating facilities at good locations outside the park. Therefore, this is the one that I endorse. It is important to maintain the integrity of this unique resource that we are so lucky to have. Let's not spoil it.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 4

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: earl j. porter
Organization: C&O Canal Asso.
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6583 edgewood road
new market, MD 21774
USA
E-mail: earlporter18@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/04/2013 Date Received: 05/04/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please...no intrusion onto the public land of the C&O Canal.

No disturbing of historical land and aqueducts.

Downstream has space for large boat house projects but not on C&O property.

The upstream project will inhibit bikers and walkers on this narrow pathway.

Please think this thru.

Earl Porter

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 5

Author Information

Keep Private:

No

Name:

Ann Satterthwaite

Organization:

Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park

Organization Type:

I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

1615-34th Street NW
Washington, DC 20007
USA

E-mail:

annthwaite@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New

Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 05/05/2013

Date Received: 05/05/2013

Number of Signatures: 1

Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Comments on the National Park Service's Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study for the Georgetown Waterfront

I am Ann Satterthwaite, AICP, chairman of the Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park. This is a personal statement. The Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park will submit a separate statement.

I have a longstanding interest in the boating activities and facilities on the Georgetown waterfront as both a resident of Georgetown and, importantly, as a professional city planner with decades of experience in recreation planning beginning with the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission, the first national study of outdoor recreation. My interest in park planning continued in projects in cities and regions throughout the country. I also have experience in conservation planning with organizations like the Conservation Foundation and in historic preservation planning in cities like Charleston, SC. Thus, my thirty five year involvement with the Georgetown waterfront park is not surprising.

After the sundry, industrial buildings along the Georgetown waterfront were demolished for the eventually abandoned Three Sisters Bridge and highway in 1970, most of the waterfront became District of Columbia property. That launched the opportunity to transform this missing link in the National Park System's remarkable greensward along the Potomac river into the gem of the now Georgetown Waterfront Park. I was responsible for organizing three different non-profit organizations involved with this transformation: first, the Committee for Washington's Riverfront Parks, which stimulated public interest in the park possibilities of both the Georgetown waterfront and the Anacostia waterfront and also spurred the National Park Service into planning for the park. In the late 1980s, NPS prepared a Georgetown waterfront park plan, which was approved by all Federal and District agencies; second, the Georgetown Waterfront Commission, established in 1997 and chaired by Senator Charles Percy, refined the earlier plan, including a plan for boathouses; and third, the Friends of the Georgetown Waterfront Park, which has seen the creation of most of the park for which it raised the funds and now is the partner with NPS on the operation of the park. While the new waterfront park is immensely popular, it is not complete. The boathouses planned for the park have not been built and the Thompson Boat Center continues to be jammed and inefficient.

Throughout this long history, the Potomac River has been the focus of the planning for the park, both for the views of the river as well as for watching rowers and boaters on the river. Even the steps for viewing the river in the park were planned at the regatta finish line. Rowing has been an iconic and historic activity on the river. The Potomac Boat Club goes back to 1869. The photographs etched on the granite slabs at the overlooks in the park today display the rowers who have plied the river over the years. Just this first week of May The Washington Post featured a photograph of rowers in the early morning mist along the waterfront. The majestic row of boathouses along the Schuylkill River has been an inspiration in our planning.

The Thompson Boat Center is and has been the linchpin in all discussions of boating and boathouses on this Georgetown section of the river. Interest in new boathouses was spurred by the deficiencies and crowded conditions at Thompson's. If Thompson's had met the needs of the growing number of public and private high school and university rowers as well as individual rowers, there would have been no need to plan new boathouses. Yet this linchpin in Potomac River boating is missing in the feasibility study. For any analysis of boating needs for this section of the river, Thompson's should have been included. What other facilities are needed depends on what Thompson's can accommodate.

The Georgetown Waterfront Commission, a joint community and NPS effort, recognized the problems at Thompson's and the need for new facilities for boaters. Hence, the Commission established a Boating Committee to prepare a plan for boating facilities. This committee, open to anyone interested in boating, included representatives of various public and private schools and universities, individual rowers, and others interested in boating. Its meetings were well publicized and its reports were discussed at the public meetings. Its recommendations became part of a refined plan in 1997. This plan recommended two university boathouses, one for George Washington University and another for Georgetown University, and possibly a boathouse for independent rowers, thus providing adequate space in Thompson's for the high school rowers. The plan and its design elements, which refined the earlier NPS plan, were approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, ANC2E, and the Citizens Association of Georgetown. The National Park Service negotiated with the two universities on the basis of this plan and entered into legal arrangements such as Memoranda of Agreements with them. Many public meetings and zoning hearings were held on this boathouse plan, which was approved by the Commission and guided the National Park Service planning of boathouses. Objections to the siting of the Georgetown University boathouse emerged after the plan was approved. Action on the boathouse has been stalled ever since. Now it seems that the approved NPS plan has been abandoned as new thoughts on the feasibility of boathouses are discussed without including the critical role of Thompson's.

The Potomac River in Georgetown is a limited resource with many and sometimes conflicting users. The public goal

is to see how these various users can be accommodated, the resources protected, and maximum public benefits obtained. The users include:

1/ Recreational kayakers and other amateur boaters. The issue of recreational kayakers and paddleboarders, which was not a significant factor a decade ago, raises new launching and safety issues. Theodore Roosevelt Island, Fletcher's with traffic controls on Canal Road, and Thompson's, including the Rock Creek side of Thompson's, could be considered launching sites for these boaters. For amateurs in this hazardous section of the river, there can be serious safety concerns as well as conflicts with other boaters.

2/ Canoeists: It appears from this study that the Washington Canoe Club with restoration remains in its current site. Jack's has a new lease, thus providing canoes and kayaks for the public to rent.

3/ Rowers: The rowers seem to be the losers in this study, as the sites mentioned are not adequate for storage of shells or for the facilities necessary for the functioning of boathouses, using the accepted standards for such activities. Boathouses are for more than storage of boats. Throughout the country both public and private universities have boathouses, which not only store their shells, but provide training facilities. How boats can be fit into different configurations proposed in this study will be discussed in detail in the FOGWP statement, as it has the benefit of the advice of skilled oarsmen. Of the sites proposed in this study: Site C is narrow and compromised by future sewer plans; Site D is small, adjacent to Key Bridge, and now partly occupied by the essential rental business of Jack's, but a small boathouse for independent rowers and boaters might fit here. Site E seems to be considered in the study as a potential site for several different boathouses, some individual and some combined. However, architects and boaters found this site barely large enough for one university boathouse, so scrunching in different institutions does not seem advisable; Site A is written off in this study as unsuitable for a boathouse, yet NPS and other bodies long considered this an appropriate site for a university boathouse, for which Georgetown University planned its boathouse. The environmental issues that have been raised are questionable. It is a fill site, or "artificial vegetated wetlands", which the Corps of Engineers does not even classify as a wetland and, hence, is not within its jurisdiction. The site may have even more invasive plants, scrub bushes, honeysuckle, and pioneer species collection-short lived trees on wet site-than it had decades ago when it was first studied. An ISA Certified arborist found mostly pioneer species, one elm, not a specimen tree, that had little canopy making its survival questionable, as it would be prey to Dutch Elm disease. That tree might be what the study sees as a "character-defining feature". This area at Site A is clearly not endowed with endangered species. Migratory birds and other wildlife have many nearby environments to enjoy in the adjacent C&O Canal land. Although on the banks of the Potomac, this site is not located in the spectacular Potomac Gorge, which is farther upstream. However, the true environmental, cultural and historic features of any site along the riverbank must be treated with great care.

A problem, which is mentioned in the study and has worsened considerably in the recent years, is the section of Water Street between Key Bridge and the Capital Crescent trailhead. The congestion of bicyclists and walkers, not just "meandering" walkers, moving and parked cars, and boaters needs immediate attention. The earlier parking scheme for K/Water Street undertaken by the Park Service should be restudied in consultation with DC DOT. as K/Water Street is a DC street. The many construction parkers from Georgetown Park Mall renovation should use the garage in the mall and not park on valuable waterfront space. Better signage is needed and even paving the street and adding markings for different users would be an improvement.

In summary, I believe this study is seriously flawed by the lack of information on Thompson's. However, of the various scenarios, I support the Development Scenario 1, High Density, with some major adjustments. This is the only scenario that provides sites for facilities for all the waterfront users. It is also the only scenario that meets the needs of the rowers. Site E can accommodate one university boathouse as planned. Site D has Jack's for canoeists and space for a small boathouse for individual rowers. Site C has limited boathouse use due to sewer plans and its narrow site. Site A could accommodate a university boathouse, as NPS planned. Concerns about views and

environmental protection can be met through sensitive design. Access is an issue, which requires careful planning, maybe by separating pedestrian and vehicular access with direct pedestrian access to the boathouse and its vehicular access in the area just east of the Washington Canoe Club. Meeting the needs of all the boating interests is the paramount concern for this study and Development Scenario 1 is the only alternative that attempts to meet the realistic needs of all those potential users of this magnificent river.

It is very disappointing that after all these decades and hundreds of thousands, maybe millions. of dollars spent on studies, environmental assessments, reports, and public open houses that we are in such an impasse today.. Instead of issuing reports and thinking about an EIS for which no one has funds, maybe a retreat for a weekend with key people representing different constituencies might move us toward a resolution of key problems now obstructing progress on this issue of boathouses and boating along the Georgetown waterfront. Then we might finally realize a completed Georgetown Waterfront Park with boathouses with adequate facilities for rowers, canoeists, kayakers, and other boaters.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 6**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Thomas L. Aitken
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Martinsburg, WV 25404
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/06/2013 Date Received: 05/06/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The C&O Canal is public land enjoyed by millions of people every year. It's upkeep is provided by taxpayers, and in no way should the park be subject to private influences. The C&O is OURS; let's keep it that way.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 7**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Sally C. Strain
Organization: Defenders of Potomac River Parkland

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 5712 Sherier Pl., NW
Washington, DC 20016
USA
E-mail: seawalk@starpower.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/06/2013 Date Received: 05/06/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Comments to NPS from Defenders of Potomac River Parkland:

Defenders of Potomac River Parkland, a coalition of 24 conservation, recreation and historic preservation groups listed below, is very pleased to endorse the "Low Density" scenario described in the feasibility study because it is the only one that protects the wooded C&O Canal National Historical Park while providing new boating facilities outside the park on degraded land in need of redevelopment. See following additional comments:

1. No new private development should be permitted within the C&O Canal NHPark. Any new facilities within the park should serve the public and be operated by NPS, either directly or through a concessionaire.
2. Team rowing facilities should be outside of the C&O Canal NHP. Any new facilities for multi-person racing shells should be outside the park.
3. The "Low Density" scenario is the only one of three described in the study that protects the natural, historic and cultural resources of the C&O Canal NHPark while providing new boating facilities at good locations outside the park.

The "Low Density" scenario: retains and enhances existing facilities within the C&O Canal National Historical Park; includes provisions outside the park for high school and collegiate rowing programs as well as for recreational paddlers and single rowing sculls; acknowledges the sensitive natural, historic and cultural resources within the park; addresses the safety issues along the narrow, congested trailhead of the Capital Crescent Trail/DC Water sewer access area within the park; and protects the "viewshed" within the park/Potomac Gorge, including the scenic views from the Key Bridge, the GW Memorial Parkway, the Canal towpath, the Potomac Heritage Trail, and the American Discovery Trail.

Reasons why the Defenders group does not support the "Medium" and "High Density" scenarios:

The "Medium" and "High Density" scenarios include major new construction inside the C&O Canal NHP. Such structures would: adversely impact adjacent natural, historic and cultural resources within the park; pose new safety and access issues along the narrow, congested trailhead of the Capital Crescent Trail in the park; possibly conflict with an important DC Water sewer project at the gateway to the park; and modify the "viewshed" of the scenic area.

We look forward to working with the National Park Service in the next phase of a "Low Density" project.

Sincerely,

Sally Strain, Coordinator Defenders of Potomac River Parkland, www.savethecanal.org

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

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 8**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: John L. Butler
Organization: WABA/CCCT/C&O Canal Assoc.
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6029 Onondaga Rd.
Bethesda, MD 20816
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/08/2013 Date Received: 05/08/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I honestly can't figure out why the park service is even considering this plan. Given the awful alternatives, I certainly advocate for the low density plan, but wonder why this is happening at all. This seems to be being pushed by the same park service officials who thought it was a great idea for Dan Snyder to cut down many trees on his property. Who is watching the conflict of interests here?!

The Capital Crescent Trail and the C and O canal is used by many, many people of all walks of life. This can not be said for the current boat house that is there (Thompsons) or for this type of activity. This is a land give away that as a tax payer I resent. A private university should not be given this land for an elite boathouse. A simple demographic study of who uses boathouses versus who uses the tow path would reveal a lot (see Dan Snyder comment above). As soon as this issue is deemed dead or dying, the park service seemed to decide, that they need another study to go forward, so this project can for some reason be built. There is something seriously wrong here. Vote NO and let this boondoggle boathouse die!

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 9

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Brian Blankinship
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Woodbridge, VA 22192
USA
E-mail: brian@Baykayaking.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/10/2013 Date Received: 05/10/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please include a (preferably free) launch site for car-top boats. All we need is parking, a way to launch (beach, low dock) and perhaps access to a bathroom or porta-potty. The Chesapeake Paddlers Association has over 700 members in the Baltimore Washington area and some of us paddle this area on a weekly basis (Thursday evenings).

I am also the owner of a sea kayak instruction and tour company and would appreciate having a location I could use to show visitors our beautiful city.

V/R,
Brian Blankinship
www.baykayaking.com

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 10

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Cecilia Oh
Organization: Washington Kayak Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4320 Old Dominion Dr.
#405
Arlington, VA 22207
USA

E-mail: ohceilia@msn.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/10/2013 Date Received: 05/10/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am very pleased hearing the NPS is studying a feasibility of opening up a possible new kayak launch site in Georgetown. I would like very much to be able to launch there. Paddling is becoming more popular, and we need more river access from DC side, a place to park; a Beach or access to the river Bank. Kayakers don't need such large, expensive facilities and are not asking taxpayers to spend much for us.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 11

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: susan b. welchman
Organization: washington canoe club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6628 rannoch rd
bethesda md 20817
washington , DC 20007
USA
E-mail: swelchma@ngs.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/10/2013 Date Received: 05/10/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

We appreciate the prominence the study gives to the restoration of the historic WCC; all three development scenarios call for restoration of the WCC structure on its present site. Vehicle access to the club for special events and boat drop-off are essential to club viability and for Emergency Services as well as Sanitation Services must be maintained. We are concerned that the sensitive natural, historic, and cultural resources within the C&O Canal NHP be fully protected. Only the Low Density scenario assures this. Congestion and conflicting uses at the trail head of the Capital Crescent Trail and the Aqueduct Arch create a

logistical and traffic nightmare and serious safety concerns for bikers, motorists and walkers. The High Density solution would exacerbate the issue by building additional boat houses and introducing more users west of the Arch. Even a modest amount of new parking would help alleviate a critical shortage for those users of The key bridge Boathouse (formerly Jack's), PBC, and WCC for whom public or self-propelled transportation is simply not an option. NPS should also be working with the city to make additional parking available along Water St. We are pleased that all three scenarios insure that recreational use of the Potomac corridor by a diverse user group - paddlers, high school and collegiate rowing programs, and bicyclists and pedestrians - will be improved.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 12

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Amber Jones
Organization: US citizen, avid hiker and biker
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington, DC 20003
USA
E-mail: consumer101@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/10/2013 Date Received: 05/10/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have been following the proposals to develop boathouses within C&O Canal National Historical Park for many years. I wish to renew my protest against any proposal to construct any new private facilities within the park, especially massive boathouses that will exclusively serve university rowing teams while destroying fish and wildlife habitat. I believe it was a travesty and a shameful action on the part of the National Park Service to find "no environmental impact" on a previous environmental assessment that evaluated the threat of private university rowing facilities within the park.

It was also shameful on the part of the National Park Service and the city of Washington, DC, to allow the entire Georgetown Waterfront Park to be built without consideration of constructing the desired new boathouses within that zone, which was previously developed and provided little or no habitat for fish and wildlife.

I have reviewed the new Georgetown Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study. I do not support any effort to clear currently wooded waterfront inside the park (including site C, which is not heavily wooded but at least is not yet developed) to build new facilities. However, since that is not one of the options you are considering, I will throw my support behind the "low density" option, to build only on sites C and E. I heartily oppose the medium and high density options.

To reiterate my concerns:

1. No new private development should be permitted within the C&O Canal National Historical Park at all. Any new facilities within the park should be minimal in size, should serve the public, and should be operated by NPS, either directly or through a concessionaire.
2. Any new private facilities, such as team rowing facilities complete with exercise rooms, social halls, and boat storage, should be built on the previously developed Georgetown waterfront outside C&O Canal National Historical Park if possible, where they will not require the destruction of large amounts of currently wooded riverfront that provides habitat for fish and wildlife.
3. The "low density" scenario is the only one of the three options described in the study that provides minimal levels of protection for the natural, historic and cultural resources of the C&O Canal National Historical Park while providing new boating facilities at appropriate locations (sites C and E) outside the currently wooded areas of the park.
4. I support the continued operation of the non-profit Washington Canoe Club on site B, because the organization has a historical precedent of operating the facility for 100 years; has a record of training successful U.S. Olympic canoe & kayak competitors and teams; providing activities and events for armed forces veterans, local schoolchildren, and other non-profit organizations; and maintaining the historic facility and grounds through volunteer labor.

I urge you to either build only on site E as well as other previously developed locations further downstream on the Georgetown waterfront, or at a minimum, adopt the "low density" option. Thank you for the opportunity to express my views.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 13**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Alma H. Gates
Organization: Committee of 100 on the Federal City
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 945 G Street, NW
Washington, DC
Washington, DC 20005
USA
E-mail: ahg71139@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/11/2013 Date Received: 05/11/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

THE COMMITTEE OF 100 ON THE FEDERAL CITY

May 10, 2013

RE: Comments on Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study ? Support for "Development Scenario 3, Low Density"

The Committee of 100 on the Federal City (C100) was founded in 1923 to act as a force of conscience in the evolution of the Nation's Capital City. It was formed to sustain and to safeguard the fundamental values ? derived from the tradition of the L'Enfant Plan and the McMillan Commission ? that give the Nation's Capital so much of its distinction, its beauty, and its grace as a community. The Committee is dedicated to providing responsible oversight in all pertinent aspects of community development. These include parks and conservation, historic preservation, visual planning and architecture, land use regulation and renewal planning, pollution control and environmental protection, and transportation planning.

C100 is pleased to submit comments to the National Park Service on the Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Feasibility Study. The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital District Elements and a review of past studies provide both land use planning guidance for the future development of the waterfront area and historic context to aid current decision making. C100 participated in the stakeholder focus groups as well as previous opportunities for discussion on the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone (NMBZ).

The task of programming appropriate uses for the site requires a plan that can accommodate multiple uses in concert with ever growing demands for recreational uses of the river. Over time, there has been clear evidence that interest in competitive rowing on the high school and collegiate levels has grown significantly and there has been an increase in the number of individual rowers as well. The competing needs among groups of rowers have grown and include a need for training facilities and more storage facilities. It is likely this demand will continue to grow over time. Recreational paddlers also use this area of the river, often in conflict with rowers. In addition, bikers, joggers and walkers along the Capital Crescent Trail, which runs parallel and adjacent to the river, add an additional layer of users of the NMBZ. Balancing the needs of all users of the river and adjacent land area while avoiding conflicts is no small feat but must be addressed.

It is the understanding of C100 that the feasibility study will lay the groundwork for future decision-making regarding: (1) scenarios for development/improvement of NPS facilities or potential land exchanges for private development of boathouses; and (2) further planning and National Environmental Policy Act/National Historic Preservation Act (NEPA) compliance as necessary to implement the NMBZ. In addition to NPS, the NMBZ study will also be reviewed by the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), the Commission of Fine Arts Old Georgetown Board and Advisory Neighborhood Commissions. Other consulting parties, including the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the DC SHPO are encouraged to offer comments; and, it is in this context that C100 submits its comments on the various development scenarios.

The Near Northwest Area Element of the Comprehensive Plan notes, "The extension of the [Georgetown] waterfront park from Washington Harbor to the Key Bridge remains a high priority. When the proposed 10-acre waterfront park is completed, the goal of closing the one remaining gap in an otherwise continuous park extending from Haines Point to the District of Columbia line will be achieved." This area of the river was once a highly intense industrial zone. It was a thriving port from which the City of Georgetown grew and expanded. Over time, with the demise of the port and industrial uses along the river, the river banks returned to a scenic park-like setting with open vistas across the Potomac to Virginia and as far as the eye can see up and down the river. Only the current low profile boathouses are nestled into the shoreline.

Development Scenario 1, High Density and Scenario 2, Medium Density, propose major new construction inside the C&O Canal NHP as well as significant height and density on degraded land outside the C&O Canal NHP, including a partial fourth story at Site D, adjacent to Key Bridge just west of Water Street. The top of the roof plus embellishments of Site D, in both scenarios, would be level with the Whitehurst Freeway. This same outcome would be true in Scenario 1, Site E, adjacent to Key Bridge just east of Water Street. While there is no documentation from the DC Department of Transportation regarding the safety of this potential distraction it is nevertheless a concern. Scenarios 1 and 2 propose height and density which is inappropriate and excessive given potential impacts to surrounding cultural and historic resources, including the Washington Canoe Club, the prime waterfront land under consideration, the important viewsheds within the Potomac Gorge and the C&O NHP, which receives more visitors each year than Yellowstone National Park.

All three scenarios propose reconstruction of the Washington Canoe Club, a historic resource located inside the C&O Canal NHP, including site restoration and rehabilitation of the structure. The Canoe Club predates the establishment of the C&O Canal NHP.

Development Scenario 3, Low Density, is the most appropriate scenario of the three proposed, and most closely aligns with the NPS' mission of stewardship of public parkland. It is also the only scenario C100 can support as it is more aligned with guidance offered by the Comprehensive Plan. This scenario proposes lower scale development than at sites proposed in Scenarios 1 and 2, permits greater stabilization of the Potomac River Banks, helps establish clean tidal flats, reduces erosion along the Potomac shoreline and along Rock Creek, preserves more of the existing forest cover and acknowledges the sensitive natural historic and cultural resources within the C&O Canal NHP. Scenario 3 meets the important goal of preservation of the forest canopy, which preserves habitat for native and migratory birds and animals that rely on forest cover for their survival. Height would be consistent with existing nearby buildings and would have limited visual impact on the context of the urban and industrial character of the NMBZ. Site E is adjacent to the Georgetown Waterfront Park, a recently established open urban park area of the riverfront that was developed using a former industrial site. This new park setting should not be overwhelmed by too-tall buildings that do not relate to or respect its purpose and open landscaped setting.

The NMBH study notes, "The ultimate number, size, and location of new structures in the zone will require further study to ensure that development balances the needs of all users and protect the historic, cultural, and environmental resources of C&O Canal NHP and Rock Creek Park." It is unclear that Scenarios 1 and 2 offer those protections. C100 opines that it would be unfortunate if the Georgetown Waterfront Park Master Plan were opened to reexamine the extent of the zone as the plan was developed following a lengthy public process.

C100 supports further study of Development Scenario 3, Low Density, and encourages NPS to move this scenario forward for further consideration based on good data, quantifiable reliable benchmarks and consideration of the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Element, the cornerstone of the Plan, which establishes the basic policies guiding the physical form of the city and provides direction on a range of development, conservation and land use compatibility issues. It recognizes the necessity to balance competing demands for finite land resources and that growth and new development need to be directed to achieve economic vitality while minimizing adverse impacts on open space. With proper land use planning, Scenario 3, Low Impact, can achieve the balance necessary to establish a nonmotorized boathouse zone while meeting the needs of all users of and visitors to the C&O Canal National Historical Park.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 14

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Jeffrey Ciabotti
Organization: Washington Canoe Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Takoma Park, MD 20912
USA
E-mail: jeffrey5@rcn.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/11/2013 Date Received: 05/11/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I wish to comment on the Georgetown Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study. The following are the key points:

1. No new private development should be permitted within the C&O Canal National Historical Park. Any new facilities within the park should serve the public and be operated by NPS, either directly or through a concessionaire.
2. Team rowing facilities should be outside of the C&O Canal NHP. Any new facilities for multi-person racing shells should be outside the park.
3. The "Low Density" scenario is the only one of three described in the study that protects the natural, historic and cultural resources of the C&O Canal NHPark while providing new boating facilities at good locations outside the park.

Thank you for the opportunity to express these views.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 15

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Margaret Alpert
Organization: NPS
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kensington, MD 20895
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 05/12/2013 Date Received: 05/12/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I wish to comment on the Georgetown Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study.

1. No new private development should be permitted within the C&O Canal National Historical Park. Any new facilities within the park should be minimal in size, should serve the public, and should be operated by NPS, either directly or through a concessionaire.

2. Any new private facilities, such as team rowing facilities, should be built outside C&O Canal National Historical Park where they will not require the destruction of large amounts of currently wooded riverfront that provides habitat for fish and wildlife.

3. The "low density" scenario is the only one of the three options described in the study that protects the natural, historic and cultural resources of the C&O Canal National Historical Park while providing new boating facilities at good locations outside the park. I urge you to adopt the "low density" option.

Thank you for the opportunity to express these views.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 16

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Ronald Wise
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
 Arlington, VA 22206
 USA
E-mail: wise_gy@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/12/2013 Date Received: 05/12/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I wish to comment on the Georgetown Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study.

1. No new private development should be permitted within the C&O Canal National Historical Park. Any new facilities within the park should be minimal in size, should serve the public, and should be operated by NPS, either directly or

through a concessionaire.

2. Any new private facilities, such as team rowing facilities, should be built outside C&O Canal National Historical Park where they will not require the destruction of large amounts of currently wooded riverfront that provides habitat for fish and wildlife.

3. The "low density" scenario is the only one of the three options described in the study that protects the natural, historic and cultural resources of the C&O Canal National Historical Park while providing new boating facilities at good locations outside the park. I urge you to adopt the "low density" option.

Thank you for the opportunity to express these views.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 17**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Linda M. Bennett
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 5 F Eastway, Greenbelt, MD 20770
Greenbelt, MD 20770
USA
E-mail: Tweetwolf@juno.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/13/2013 Date Received: 05/13/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear National Park Service Official,

Please find my comments on the Georgetown Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study. I have been following this issue for the past 10 years. I frequently kayak along the area affected. I have been shocked that the National Park Service would allow development of this national park land. The Potomac Watershed is a unique natural resource. The area where the development will occur is a refuge to urban residents and a national treasure.

No new private development should be permitted within the C&O Canal National Historical Park. Any new facilities within the park should be minimal in size, should serve the public, and should be operated by NPS, either directly or through a concessionaire.

Any new private facilities, such as team rowing facilities, should be built outside C&O Canal National Historical Park

where they will not require the destruction of large amounts of currently wooded riverfront that provides habitat for fish and wildlife.

The "low density" scenario is the only one of the three options described in the study that protects the natural, historic and cultural resources of the C&O Canal National Historical Park while providing new boating facilities at good locations outside the park. I urge you to adopt the "low density" option.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Sincerely,

Linda M. Bennett

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 18**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Karen M. Gray
Organization: C&O Canal Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1747 Edgewood Hill Circle #102
Hagerstown, MD 21740-3373
USA
E-mail: kmgrayphd@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/13/2013 Date Received: 05/13/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

It is critical, especially in a high use sections of the city and the park such as Georgetown and its waterfront are, that a policy of low density use in park lands be established and strictly maintained. High use brings higher maintenance, loss of the valuable scenic and other resources of the park, and increased safety issues to say nothing of requiring more personnel for management, etc. In this time when park budgets are shrinking, the last direction to go is toward an unnecessary higher use of the park's riverfront.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 19**

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Janine Blaeloch
Organization: Western Lands Project
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: PO Box 95545
Seattle, WA 98105
USA
E-mail: blaeloch@westernlands.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/13/2013 Date Received: 05/13/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The Western Lands Project is a non-profit, membership organization conducting research, outreach, and advocacy for responsible federal land exchange policy. We also scrutinize a broad range of projects that propose to sell, give away, or relinquish public control of public lands and any project that would privatize public land.

Western Lands first became involved in issues pertaining to the C&O National Historic Park when a land exchange was proposed to facilitate development of a Georgetown University boathouse. We were strongly opposed to that project. We believe that no new private developments should be allowed within the NHP and would oppose any development that might further erode the historical and public nature of the Park.

I have visited the Park several times. In addition to my perspective as an activist who works daily to keep public land public, there is that of someone from the other coast--to whom places such as the C&O Canal are deeply impressive and moving. The privatization of such a place, whether literal or figurative, would be a crime against the very concept of public land.

To that end, we support the low-density alternative examined in the feasibility study and would oppose the other alternatives.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 20

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Thomas L. Perry
Organization: C&O Canal Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 116 S. Conococheague Street
Williamsport, MD 21795
USA

E-mail: perrywinklehaus@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/13/2013 Date Received: 05/13/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

In my judgment the proposed Georgetown Boathouse is still too large; why not find a way to move it down river? The C&O Canal Towpath needs protected from wear and tear of usage which intersects the canal towpath, which this project would increase.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 21**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert B. Norris
Organization: Individual
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3901 Cathedral Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20016
Washington, DC 20016
USA
E-mail: Bob.Norris@Inf.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/14/2013 Date Received: 05/14/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am pleased to offer the following comments on the five designated sites and the possible development scenarios applicable to those sites. I wish to emphasize that I understand the "scenarios are not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to represent generalized approaches" to the possible future development treatment of each site. Study, p. i.

Site A. As proposed by the Low Density scenario, this site should remain undeveloped. The site is environmentally unacceptable for potential development and should be rejected for this purpose. The public's use and enjoyment of this treasured but already congested area would be preserved. The site should remain untouched and the historic

and scenic features of the C&O Canal NHP would be protected. This sentiment is reinforced by the vast majority of the public comments set forth in Appendix E. There are also numerous and well documented environmental, health and safety concerns to development of this site. The late Carl A. Linden, who died on April 2, 2012, correctly observed that development at Site A "would create a hazardous chokepoint at a major entrance" to the Park. Study, Appendix E, Correspondence 18. Our community will miss Carl's wise counsel and visionary leadership in the defense of the Park he so loved.

Site B. As recommended in all three development scenarios, I support the restoration of the Washington Canoe Club structure. This historic landmark should be preserved.

Site C. This site is located between the eastern boundary of the Washington Canoe Club property and the Aqueduct Bridge. It was formerly known as the Dempsey site. Key Bridge Boathouse, the successor to Jack's Canoe and Kayak operation, should be relocated from Site D to Site C. It would be easy to move the small "log cabin" office building currently located in the parking lot at Site D. The Key Bridge Boathouse rental operation consists ostensibly of floating docks strung together on which kayaks and canoes are stacked. Therefore, moving the Key Bridge Boathouse operation to Site C would result in only a minor inconvenience. By placing the Key Bridge Boathouse next to the Washington Canoe Club, there would be the additional benefit of grouping like uses (paddlers) side by side on the waterfront.

Site D. The Park Service and Georgetown University should give serious consideration to locating the GU boathouse at Site D, the current location of the Key Bridge Boathouse operation. This site is the area between Key Bridge and the Potomac Boat Club and includes the three townhouses. With respect to the townhouses, the Park Service will acquire the first two (3524 and 3526 Water St.) from GW in exchange for GW's boathouse site at Site E between Key Bridge and 34th St. I further understand that the Park Service intends to purchase the third townhouse (3528 Water St.) which is currently owned by "3528 K St. Ass. LP" The Park Service would then have the townhouses razed as they are considered inappropriate for that location anyway. Of course, in order to acquire this property from the Park Service, Georgetown University would exchange its upriver parcel and its mile-long easement over the Capital Crescent Trail.

The estimated length of site D along the river is 200 ft., along Water St., 230 ft., and the depth from the street to the river about 100 ft. If the average length of this site is about 215 ft., the square footage of this site is approximately 21,500 sq. ft. Since the Park Service intends to limit the footprint of Georgetown University's boathouse wherever it may ultimately be located to no more than 15,000 sq. ft., there is obviously more than ample space at this site to accommodate all of the university's needs associated with its rowing program, including an interior rowing tank.

There are many advantages for locating GU's boathouse at Site D. This site is within the non-motorized boathouse zone but outside the C&O Canal NHP. This site, unlike sites within the park, would not adversely impact the historic and scenic features of the C&O Canal. Also, there would be no height restrictions on the boathouse at this site as contemplated in the Medium and High Density scenarios. Since the site fronts on Water St., it is easily accessible with no requirement for vehicular turnaround. This location would also avoid the safety problems inherent in the congestion at the somewhat narrow gateway of the Capital Crescent Trail which is used by hundreds of bikers and hikers every day of the year. Finally, Site D poses no environmental concerns.

Site E. I understand that George Washington University has been promised Site E, located between 34th and Key Bridge for its boathouse. To advance its claim GW purchased two of the three townhouses (3524 and 3526 Water St.) which GW intends to convey to the Park Service in exchange for Site E. The Park Service should clarify this situation. This site offers all of the benefits described in my supporting explanation of the construction of a boathouse at Site D.

The adoption of these recommendations would "cluster" GW's boathouse, GU's boathouse and the Potomac Boat Club, thereby creating a "boathouse row" around the commanding presence of Key Bridge. As an additional inducement for this proposal, the high school rowing programs would also benefit. Since GU and GW would vacate the Thompson Boat Center, it would reduce substantially the currently overcrowded conditions in that facility. And, as an additional benefit, GU and GW should consider allowing some of the high school rowing programs to use their facilities on a time and space availability basis.

Since the siting of boathouses for both GW and GU, as well as the relocation of the Key Bridge Boathouse, must be approved environmentally after the preparation of either an EIS or an EA, the projects should be considered together, thereby avoiding a duplication of effort and expense. And finally, the construction of boathouses for GW and GU would not require sorely needed public funding.

Respectively submitted,

Robert B. Norris

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 22**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert M. Hirsch
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1852 Columbia Rd. NW
Apt. 602
Washington, DC 20009
USA
E-mail: rmhirsch49@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/14/2013 Date Received: 05/14/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I appreciate that the National Park Service is considering the issue of public access to the Potomac River in Georgetown for non-motorized boating use. I am an individual who likes to row and to kayak and I have been very frustrated by the lack of movement to improve access to these activities. The overcrowding at Thompson's Boat Center is severe. Early mornings see a great deal of congestion including universities, high schools, Rock Creek Rowing, instructional rowing programs and private individuals rowing. I have been there, many times on a cold dark morning just waiting for the traffic on the apron or the docks to clear so my fellow rowers and I can get on or off the river. The two universities, Georgetown and George Washington, have long indicated a willingness and desire to

build new boat houses at their own expense. These would greatly relieve pressure on the Thompson's facility.

The Potomac River in Washington represents a great recreational experience and the National Park Service needs to help the community move forward to make this experience more accessible than it presently is. Arguments about preserving a "natural landscape" along the river front make no sense. All of the land along the River has been made and re-made multiple times by humans, modifying the landscape to their purposes. Increasing the number of boating facilities would be a major enhancement of this waterfront. Washington should emulate the great riverscapes of Philadelphia and Boston. Properly designed and maintained boathouses, and the boating activities they serve, are a major enhancement of the quality of the riverfront, even for those who may never set foot in a boat.

The overcrowding and inadequacy of facilities for rowing on has been a known problem for decades. It is time to get on with solving it. In this case, it does not demand substantial federal or city funds. Rather, a change in land-use policy by the Park Service could be sufficient to allow this great river resource to attain its real recreational and esthetic potential.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Robert M. Hirsch

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 23

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization: Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail: rvomeigen@foley.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/14/2013 Date Received: 05/14/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

FRIENDS OF GEORGETOWN WATERFRONT PARK

I. INTRODUCTION

Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park (FOGWP) is a non-profit community-based organization whose mission is to

support development of the Georgetown Waterfront Park, located on the Potomac River. Rowing has been an iconic and historic activity on the Potomac River in Georgetown since the mid-19th century. Today, the photographs etched on the granite slabs at the overlooks in the Park display the rowers who have plied the river since the mid-19th century.

FOGWP has had a long-standing interest in encouraging visitors to the Park to enjoy a connection with the river. From the inception of FOGWP's predecessor organization, the Georgetown Waterfront Park Commission (Commission) in 1997, to the present day, we have supported the development of nonmotorized boating facilities on the Georgetown waterfront. Our ultimate objective has been to create a seamless waterfront taking advantage of the river and its activities, green and interesting.

In 1987, the National Park Service (NPS) developed the Georgetown Waterfront Park Master Plan, which designated a portion of the Potomac River shoreline adjacent to the Georgetown Waterfront Park as a suitable location for boathouses to support nonmotorized boating on the Upper Potomac River ? Non-Motorized Boating Zone (NMBZ). In April 2013, NPS issued a document entitled "Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study" (Study). An NPS consultant, The Louis Berger Group, Inc., prepared the Study.

In the more than 30 years since the Master Plan was developed, no boathouses have been built in the NMBZ, despite a substantial increase in the demand for boathouse space on the Georgetown waterfront during these decades. During this period NPS conceptual materials for the Park routinely focused on rowing shells on the river as a major component of the Park's appeal. There have been repeated studies, environmental assessments, and other plans for boathouse construction ? collectively at very substantial cost - but they have all been shelved without action.

The purpose of the 2013 Boathouse Study is to once again revisit the issue of boathouses on the Potomac, again considering "what uses can be accommodated in this area, given a broader range of user demand, the size limitations of the area, and other site constraints."

II. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

The NPS 2013 Study identifies five potential boathouse sites within the NMBZ (Sites A through E). (See, Study, p. iv, Figure ES-1 "Development Sites.") Sites A to D are upstream from Key Bridge, and Site E is downstream. Site A is farthest from the Bridge. The Study then presents three scenarios for development of the NMBZ: High Density; Medium Density, and Low Density.

FOGWP favors the High Density alternative to developing the NMBZ, with some major adjustments, as discussed below. Highlights of the approach we recommend include the following:

? Locating an appropriately scaled university rowing boathouse at Site A.

? Expanding the Washington Canoe Club (WCC) facility at Site B to meet expressed demand for more paddling capacity, including free public launch space.

? Adapting Site C to provide temporary trailer parking for loading and unloading boats, and occasional use for other purposes such as headquarters special runs, cycling events, etc. Site C should not be used as a parking lot.

? Retaining Site D (currently Key Bridge Boats) as a paddling rental and tour site with the added function of providing limited public launch space.

? Locating an appropriately scaled university rowing boathouse at Site E.

? Removing all small boats from Thompson Boat Center (TBC) (located downstream from the NMBZ), and accommodating them at Sites B and D, and possibly at Fletcher's Boathouse which is located upstream from the NMBZ.

? Renovating or rebuilding TBC for use by public and private high school rowing teams. (13 high schools currently use TBC, in addition to two university teams and individual rowers and paddlers).

III. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

A. Addressing the Needs of Paddlers.

To move toward the objective of creating a seamless, functional waterfront, FOGWP has always insisted that the whole length of the Georgetown waterfront area, from TBC up through the upstream end of the NMBZ at Site A, be considered as a whole. Up until the announcement of the present Study, we understood that the NPS agreed with this approach. For several decades, we understood from the NPS that Thompson's would be part of the plan, although the order of attention would begin with planning for the two large university boathouses that would be built with private funds at Sites A and E.

Simultaneously, a "small-boat boathouse" would be created in the NMBZ for small privately-owned boats (singles, kayaks, etc.), and for a small boat rental service. This could be a new structure built at Site C, or these functions could be integrated with existing NPS facilities, at Site D, Site B and even upstream at Fletcher's Boathouse, all of which are currently in use for small-boat storage and rental.

With the departure of the universities and the small boats from TBC, improvements to the building could be made to make it more efficient for supporting high school rowing programs. The entire system was always seen as interconnected to maximize the most efficient use of the river and adjacent land. In light of this long-term "holistic" understanding of the river, we were particularly alarmed to discover that the NPS 2013 Study does not include TBC in the scope of the Study. Yet TBC is the core of the rowing presence on the river today

The Study asserts that there is greatly increased demand for paddling facilities, but does not cite any source for this conclusion. In contrast, the unsatisfied demand for rowing space is quite obvious--simply watching the morning and evening practices times at TBC and at the privately-owned Potomac Boat Club (PBC), reveals the crowding and pressure of many crews competing for limited space. There is no similar level of paddling activity observed by those who spend time daily on the river.

Even assuming that there is an increased demand for paddling, it is possible to address this demand without using Site A for a paddling facility, or having to build new facilities. In addition to TBC, NPS currently owns Key Bridge Boats (formerly Jack's Boats), Washington Canoe Club and Fletcher's to the west of the NMZB. A modest improvement of the functionality of these facilities can address the need for additional paddling facilities.

Specifically, the most creative solution to the paddling problem, and others cited in the Study is to expand the functionality of the WCC, which is located at Site D. The WCC could meet expanded paddling needs and could greatly benefit from an influx of funds and support so that WCC's historic structure can be restored. NPS has determined that it owns both the WCC land and structure, thus NPS could include paddling rentals as the physical condition of the underused, deteriorating WCC structure is improved once again. Moreover, a free launch site at WCC would benefit the paddling public. The NPS could require these services in whatever contract, concession agreement or lease it develops with WCC, as well as with its contracts/leases at Key Bridge and Fletcher's.

Locating public launch capability at existing operations would be a safer and less burdensome method of assuring public launch since there are "eyes on" the process at those places. The concessioners/lessees can maintain safe docks and control over the launch process that free-standing, unmonitored launches cannot provide. Launching at WCC would bring a welcome addition to the public opportunities for access to the river. Those launching would have to park on Water St like the recreational users in that area do now.

B. Solving Parking and Congestion Problems.

Again, taking the waterfront as a whole, there is crowding, congestion, and too much interaction among cars, commuter bikes, pedestrians, joggers and rollerbladers along the Potomac. This creates serious safety issues for all. In part, these problems arise from a lack of parking and in part a lack of delineation or way-finding signs in the waterfront area.

Parking on Water Street, which is a D.C. public street, needs thoughtful planning to increase safety and accessibility for its range of users. This is a much bigger issue than any one constituency can take on. This is an important issue to be addressed in the context of decisions made about use of NMBZ sites and in coordination with the DC government.

C. Identifying Site A for A University Boathouse.

Site A, which is the farthest upriver site within the Study area, has come to be a controversial location for a university boathouse, without persuasive reason. It is our understanding that some time ago, the NPS urged Georgetown University (GU) to accept Site A as the location of a GU boathouse to be built with private funds. The 2013 Study's elimination of Site A from consideration for a university boathouse is unexplained. It is a significant departure from the NPS position on this site for many years.

The environmental issues that some have raised regarding Site A are questionable at best. Site A is a fill site or "artificial vegetated wetlands," which the Corps of Engineers does not classify as a wetland. Hence, Site A is not within the Corps jurisdiction. Site A currently has more invasive plants, scrub bushes and pioneer species collection-short lived trees on wet site-than it had decades ago when it was first studied. As recently as November 2010, an independent ISA Certified arborist found mostly pioneer species at Site A, and concluded that Site A is clearly not an area with endangered vegetative species. Furthermore, migratory birds and other wildlife currently at Site A have many nearby environments to enjoy in the adjacent C&O Canal land. We are convinced that Site A does not present any serious environmental issues.

There has been additional controversy regarding whether a boathouse on Site A would momentarily block Capital Crescent Trail bicycler's or trail hiker's view of the river as an individual approaches the Trailhead. Contrary to the impression left by this report's description of Site A, the area is hardly a wild or even rural seeming area. For example, the trail exposes bikes and hikers to views of the GW Parkway and the Rosslyn skyline across the River. Traffic sounds from nearby Key Bridge and Canal Road can be easily heard from the Trail as the urban environment of lower Georgetown emerges at the end of the Trail. Further, any new boathouse located anywhere on the River will create a visual obstacle, briefly seen, on a moving bike.

Most important, even if a boathouse on Site A presented a momentary obstacle in a biker's view of the river, rowers' need for river access along a shoreline with limited points of access must be weighed against the minor visual inconvenience to bikers a boathouse presents. The NPS Study fails to address this. Instead, the Study makes a critical error in eliminating Site A from consideration as a site for a university boathouse, and we recommend that Site A be designated for one of the university boathouses.

As an alternative way to accommodate both WCC and a university boathouse is to treat Site A as a place for relocating or rebuilding the WCC structure. Such a building could be smaller than a rowing boathouse, and might be considered a better fit from the point of view of the Trail users. In turn, Site B would lend itself to a rowing boathouse of the appropriate size in a location seemingly less controversial with Trail users. This possibility has been raised in the past, including the potential offer of funds to assist with the effort, but the NPS study does not refer to this proposal.

D. Providing Information for Evaluating the Functional Capacity of Each Site.

The Study includes four Figures showing the possible layout of water craft in each of the four prospective building sites (A,C,D,E). Site B, the WCC location, is not included in the analysis. Thus, the functional capacity of the WCC site is not clear.

The minimal information provided on each site is not sufficient to allow an evaluation of the actual capacity of each site. This information is critical for evaluating the usefulness of a site for rowing, where shells can be 60' long, and at whatever length, very fragile and difficult to maneuver. Accordingly, the schematic drawings included in the NPS Study are not helpful in evaluating each site for boathouse use. Much more nuanced and detailed schematics would be needed for each site, including Site A, to evaluate the suitability of the various site for alternative uses.

In addition, the schematics focus only on the capacity of the first/boat bay floor. The Study does not address the need for additional boathouse space for many important program elements that are not even mentioned in the Study. These include: a main gathering space; a weight room; a training room; team and guest locker rooms for men and women; an open viewing deck for regattas; an entry space; bathrooms; storage; coaches office; and first aid and mechanical space. The Study omits to address the need for boathouse space for each of these important functions.

In summary, FOGWP believes NPS can and should be much more proactive in accommodating rowing as well as other users of the NMBZ, and that water-dependent uses of the NMBZ should in all cases weigh more heavily than land-based uses even in the areas not far from the riverfront.

E. Miscellaneous Comments and Errors in the Study

1. Many rowers are simply omitted from the tables and summaries of activity leading to questions about the number more generally

Washington Lee-High School, a Virginia public high school with a crew team of some 100 youth, practices at Potomac Boat Club on five or six afternoons a week, and sometimes in the mornings as well.

The Masters rowing and Olympic training teams are not mentioned at all in the chart of users. PBC's Masters women and men launch 25 to 40 people each morning, and another 20 in the afternoons. PBC's Elite Scullers launches 15 people twice-a-day, five to six days a week. TBC has scores of adult team rowers as well.

2. Contrary to the report's assertion, Potomac Boat Club (PBC) was listed in the National Register in 1991, and is also in the D.C. inventory of Historic Places. Also WCC was not built in 1896 but in 1904, according to its own website.

3. The summary of rowing racecourses is quite incomplete. The 1k-meter race course is for the Masters sprint races; the 1.5k meter course is for high school sprints; the 2k meter course is for college sprints; and the 5k meter course is

for fall head racing. Regattas using all these distances are held every year on the Potomac.

4. There is a mistaken suggestion that the river cannot handle the existing water traffic. The Study alludes, from time to time, to potential conflicts among users on the water without mentioning the responsibility users have taken on themselves to mitigate them. It is true that the variety of craft and of levels of proficiency can create some worrisome situations. Recognizing the need for users to be aware of safety issues, more than a decade ago, the river users formed the Potomac River Safety Committee to bring users together to discuss and agree upon certain conventions, such as traffic patterns. This system of self-management has worked well, the traffic patterns and other agreements are observed, and although these rules are not legally enforceable, the safety record is very good.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on issues that deeply concern the Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park.

Sincerely,

Robert P. vom Eigen
President

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 24**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Rebecca L. Martin
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 24966 Mineral Springs Circle
Stone Ridge, VA 20105
USA
E-mail: RImartin119@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/14/2013 Date Received: 05/14/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As kayaker in this area, I would like to have easy access to the water. We just need the following: a place to park, a beach to launch and a port-a-potty. If you could spare the expense, a kayak launch to enter and exit but I would settle for the three main items. Parking, beach and bathroom facilities.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 25

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Sarah E. Gulick
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2005 Halyard Ln
Reston, VA 20191
USA
E-mail: sarah@studioup.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/15/2013 Date Received: 05/15/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To be on the river is to really get to know DC. One more paddler who would be extremely appreciative of a public (or free/inexpensive) place to launch. Parking, a place to go to the bathroom, and no time limits are main priorities. Thanks for working to ensure everyone is able to enjoy the river, it is an incredible resource and I look forward to seeing access evolve.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 26

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Shane Farthing
Organization: Washington Area Bicyclist Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2599 Ontario Rd., NW
Washington, DC 20009
USA
E-mail: shane@waba.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/15/2013 Date Received: 05/15/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear National Park Service:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association and the region's bicyclists on this feasibility study for the development of this critical section of the Potomac waterfront. As we have done consistently throughout this process in several public meetings, WABA again expresses strong concern over the potential impact of development on the usability of critical bicycling infrastructure such as the Capital Crescent Trail. As the feasibility study and numerous other studies show, the usage rates of the CCT and bicycling facilities within the study area dwarfs the number of potential boathouse users and other interests and should be given proportionate weight as alternatives are considered that might impact the usability of the trail for that great number of users.

This feasibility study, while outlining only development options and not assessing the possibility of non-development as a NEPA document must, provides limited clarity on the potential traffic conflicts and operational impacts on bicycle travel through the study zone and thus does little to allay the fears of bicyclists that increased development will mean greater risk of conflicts with motor vehicles, event crowds, and individuals loading and unloading boats. Already, the Capital Crescent Trail is crowded at its southern end and crashes, while not overly common, are not rare. Any level of development, as studied here, would make the trail less safe unless significant steps and investment not proposed here were taken and made to avoid such impacts by ensuring appropriate access without interference with trail users.

Nothing in this feasibility study allays WABA's longstanding concerns about the appropriateness of NPS development of park parcels for the benefit of private entities. Nothing in this feasibility study allays our concerns regarding the likely negative impacts of development on the Capital Crescent Trail and possible the C&O Canal towpath. As a result, we continue to oppose development in this area.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document, drafted by development advisors to provide the National Park Service with additional clarity on its development alternatives. We look forward to the return to the legally mandated NEPA process in which non-development will also be duly considered, and the competing interests—including the overwhelming public usage rates of trail users as compared to boaters—given their fair consideration. It is our hope that the alternatives presented there, in addition to including non-development as a possibility, will address the trail usage issue in greater detail through a combination of appropriate density and improvements to keep the trail unimpeded by surrounding changes.

Sincerely,

Shane Farthing
Executive Director, Washington Area Bicyclist Association

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 27

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Erik J. Meyers

Organization: The Potomac Boat Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3530 Water Street. NW
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail: erikjmeyers@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/15/2013 Date Received: 05/15/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The Potomac Boat Club
3530 Water Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007

May 12, 2013
Ms. Tammy Stidham
National Capital Region
National Park Service
Washington, DC via email tammy_stidham@nps.gov

Re: Public/Stakeholder Comment on Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study (dated April 2013)

Dear Ms. Stidham:

I am pleased to submit these comments on behalf of the members and Board of Governors of the Potomac Boat Club, currently the only rowing boathouse within the proposed Non-motorized Boathouse Zone (NMBZ) and the oldest Washington, DC institution for non-motorized boating, on the recently released final draft Feasibility Study. Founded in 1869, the Club has been at its current Potomac shoreline location in Georgetown since 1908. As owners of the oldest building on the District's Potomac waterfront, we welcome efforts to expand the number of facilities that would be able to accommodate those interested in rowing. Interest in the sport has expanded significantly since Thompson's Boat Center opened in 1960 and existing facilities have struggled to keep pace. With its latest study now complete, we encourage the National Park Service to move swiftly to provide a clear path for new rowing facilities.

We have seen the demand for access to the Potomac increase substantially in recent decades. In response, we have stretched our 105 year old, National Register-listed landmark facility physically and programmatically. Our members and guests appreciate the unique and precious access they enjoy to the Potomac. We own the only non-Federal non-motorized waterfront facility in the District of Columbia, and we are well aware that many other rowers using Thompson's make-do with temporary, outdoor storage and crowded launching docks. This knowledge has propelled the Club to offer an ever-widening array of programs and accommodate a larger number of individuals than at any time in club history. We sponsor a wide variety of non-motorized boating recreation -- including single, double and quadruple sculls; pairs with and without coxswains, fours with and without coxswain, and eight-oared sweep racing

shells; and canoes, kayaks, and paddleboards -- and our members and guests cover all skill levels, from novice rower and paddler, all the way to Olympic gold medalists. We have programs ranging from introductory learn-to-row or scull to our Open Sculling (US National Team-level) Program and including men's and women's Masters (age-group) competitive rowing programs, and breast cancer survivor rowing programs. Since 1949 PBC has hosted the Washington-Lee High School (a major Arlington, VA public high school). Over 100 W-L students, boys and girls, currently use the Club throughout their season. PBC hosts scholastic and open competition regattas such as the Charlie Butt Scullers Head of the Potomac Regatta, a 30 year tradition on America's fall rowing calendars that draws thousands of competitors and spectators. Yet, despite all we have done, it does not even come close to meeting the present demand for rowing access to the upper Potomac.

One agency ? the National Park Service ? controls virtually the entire upper Potomac River waterfront from Alexandria to Chain Bridge. Unlike a bike trail or footpath, a river needs specific points of access to accommodate those who would recreate on it. The Service's near exclusive ownership of the shoreline imposes a special obligation on it to accommodate members of the public who seek to use their river. By publishing this Study, the Service has a fresh opportunity to move forward to better accommodate the current level of demand for new rowing facilities and access for paddle-sports within its defined Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone (NMBZ) and provide a measure of capacity to meet future demand.

General comments

The Potomac Boat Club is generally pleased that all draft alternatives (High, Medium, and Low) would provide for new rowing boathouses in the NMBZ. We would support boathouses at any and all sites identified.

However, we are quite disappointed that the Service failed to clearly assign priority to water-based recreation. For 30 years, the Service has limited discussions of siting new rowing boathouse facilities to locations generally within what is now proposed as the NMBZ. The Georgetown Waterfront Park plan, in particular, identified the zone as the place where new university and public boathouses would be built. This draft Study, however, assigns no particular weight to water-based uses for the waterfront. The Service has said it will not entertain any discussion of expansion at Thompson's Boat Center or any other location on the District's Potomac shoreline for new rowing boathouses. The proposed NMBZ is where PBC, Jack's Boats canoe livery, and the Washington Canoe Club facility are presently located and where historically other boathouses, such as Georgetown University's and Dempsey's, once stood. It is only here that the Service has indicated it will consider permitting new rowing facilities or providing more paddling access. Given this fixed NPS limit, we believe water-dependent uses need to be assigned clear priority over land-based uses in the NMBZ.

The Study not only fails to assign priority for water-dependent access over land-based uses but actually appears to assign greater weight to land-based uses for which there are reasonable alternatives. One specific example of weighting land-based use over water-dependent uses of this sliver of Potomac waterfront is visible in Table 2. Specifically, we were surprised to see Table 2 conflate users of the C & O Canal Towpath with users of the NMBZ. The NMBZ is carefully defined in geographic terms down to the precise number of feet above the Key Bridge and by the northern edge of Water/ K Street. Clearly the Canal Towpath is outside of the Zone, but the Study includes the Towpath's use by an estimated 400,000 annual visitors as additional traffic in the NMBZ. The Service also estimates, without any demonstrated support, a minimum 54% increase since 2006 in use of the Capital Crescent Trail . Further, it bases its estimate of Trail use on an unwavering 23,000 users every week, no matter ice, snow, or other adverse conditions. The purpose of these numbers appears calculated to weight decisions against any slight increase in people in the NMBZ arising from siting new rowing facilities or access points for canoes and paddle sport craft.

Our impression of weighting land-based uses over those on the water is reinforced both by data omitted on current numbers of rowers and by suggestions that conditions on the river are overly crowded (as opposed to crowding at the few points of access.) In terms of omitted data, we were disappointed to see that Table 2 did not count Washington-

Lee High School users who use PBC daily from February to early June. And this Table also failed to count collegiate regatta participants and those participating in PBC's annual Scullers Head of the Potomac Regatta. This information was readily available. For it to not be included is difficult to explain. The study comments in multiple locations about the impact of shell trailers on traffic on Water and K Streets in the NMBZ from regattas, scholastic and otherwise . The Study also ascribes river congestion being primarily due to novice crews crowding the river above Thompson's. The note continues to suggest that these crews somehow interfere with docked powerboats at Washington Harbor and get in trouble thus causing wakes that result in the summons of Harbor Branch police units. The reader is left with the impression that the river, not existing facilities, is at capacity. [Note: Interestingly, no capacity issue is raised with reference to the Capital Crescent Trail (or Towpath) which the Survey reports increasingly at 9 per cent annual rate without any end in sight.]

Although the Service seems comfortable with ever-increasing use of the Capital Crescent Trail, it takes a different view in discussing increased recreational use of the river. Although the Service controls the land on the shoreline, it has no role in regulating river volume or traffic. Why the river should be considered overcrowded when its width not to mention length are multiples of the Trail and Towpath where the Service expresses no concern about rising use levels, is not explained. The Study lists without priority the need to accommodate such land-based activities as commuter bicycling, tour bus parking, and "meandering pedestrians" in the NMBZ , giving the impression that water-dependent uses of the NMBZ are not a priority, notwithstanding the existence of reasonable alternatives for land-based activities.

We favor new boathouses at all locations indicated within the NMBZ, namely A, C, D and E. However, beyond the NMBZ, there are additional options not discussed or considered. We suggest that additional locations be identified ? not to delay action on siting facilities within the NMBZ but rather because there are additional places that would be consistent with good stewardship of the public domain and improved access for river based recreation. Additional locations beyond the NMBZ would also reduce the impact of concentrating more river access in one small area. In addition, we observe that it matters how prospective users would get to new facilities or bring boats to the water. The boathouses proposed by Georgetown and George Washington Universities would be used primarily by campus-based students who would arrive and depart on foot or bicycle. Those boathouses would not be adding appreciably to the volume of vehicular traffic on K and Water Streets. By contrast, car top launch sites or additional paddle-sport boat storage would lead to increased vehicular traffic and parking demands on the NMBZ area. At Potomac Boat Club, we already experience a shortage of parking at peak times in the early morning and afternoon due to the limited number of spaces in the area and increased development and visitation generally in Georgetown.

We are interested in the Service and the District agreeing on a safer transition for users of the Capital Crescent Trail and Water/K Streets, particularly for cyclists. What we do not agree is that this is an issue those seeking new water-dependent rowing and other recreational boating facilities need to resolve. The problem exists due to the failure of the Service and the District to address the transition of the Trail into Water/ Street starting in 1990. To suggest that the Service's failure to address the conflict must now be shouldered by those seeking sites for new boathouses is patently unreasonable. The problem exists now and thus has nothing to do with whether or not future boathouses are built in the NMBZ. The Service needs to solve this problem working the District government and not conflate it with the question of where best to site new boating facilities.

Comments on Specific Site and Density Alternatives

The Study's High and Medium alternative propose a "paddle sports" boathouse at Site A but not a rowing facility for which demand has been well established. PBC is puzzled by this recommendation for following reasons:

- 1 A review of comments submitted shows none advocating a new paddle sports boathouse (while several favor car top or walk-in access points);
- 2 A review of the reports from the 10 work groups at the Service's one day Public Stakeholder Workshop shows 6 of

10 favored a university boathouse at Site A; two, a mixed facility; one, a canoe facility; and one, no development;
3 The Service closed the Washington Canoe Club facility that it owns at Site B and placed all boats into open air racks with no timetable for returning boats to interior storage; and
4 The Study references no actual proposal or available funding for new canoe/ paddle sports facility or retrofitting the existing one.

These facts lead us to conclude that the proposed new paddle sport facility is more a speculative proposition than supported by any viable demand or capacity to deliver. We recommend a "fix it first" policy for paddle sport storage capacity: the Service and those interested in a facility for storage of canoes, kayaks and other paddle sports should conduct repairs of the WCC facility so boats can again be stored in its bays. We also observe that, since the Study repeatedly makes the point that the Service owns the WCC grounds and facility, there seems no impediment to the Service making those docks available to those seeking a launching point for walk-in or car-topped boats. While there is a problem of parking in the immediate area of WCC, it would be possible to drop off a boat to paddle and park elsewhere on Water/K Streets in public metered spaces or in private parking garages. This is what regular users of Potomac BC and WCC currently do. We would not support limiting Site A to a paddle sports facility until after WCC is restored and one or more sites are occupied by the universities currently seeking to undertake land exchanges for sites and building rowing boathouses at their own expense.

We recommend serious consideration of Site A for a rowing boathouse. As indicated on page 60, access to Site A could be provided across the apron in front of the existing Site B facility (WCC) that NPS owns and operates. Thus, were Georgetown able to locate its proposed boathouse on site A, the Service could exchange a limited access easement (right-of-way) across the site B for the 15 foot wide, mile long right- of-way Georgetown currently owns in the same corridor as the Capital Crescent Trail. Site A would be feasible for a rowing boathouse if a trailer were able to load and unload racing shells from Site C from where they could be carried the short distance to Site A storage. Emergency and service access to Site A could be over the existing roadway in front of WCC over which WCC members have driven and parked for years. The 50-plus years of active vehicle use of this route suggests that the Dulles Interceptor Sewer would support such periodic vehicular access. Any required parking for physically handicapped individuals and for boat trailer loading and unloading could be accommodated on Site C. However, since Georgetown's users would be students coming from its nearby campus, most users would come to the site on foot or bike and not by motor vehicles.

We do not support using Site C for parking as indicated in the Low density development option. Although Potomac Boat Club members experience limited parking at peak use times, the small NMBZ designated by the Service should be used for water dependent purposes, not surface parking. While vehicular parking is a need, this is the wrong place for it. We oppose eliminating a boathouse or water access related use at Site C and converting it into a surface parking facility. Unless a rowing boathouse can be accommodate on Site A as proposed in these comments and supported in part by using Site C to provide access for boat loading and unloading at facilities at Sites A and B, we would oppose use of Site C for parking since that purpose can be accommodated in a non-shoreline location.

Although as previously suggested, some canoe or paddle board launching by walk-in or car-top users could be accommodated within the NMBZ at Site B (with parking back on Water/ K Street) we respectfully suggest that a preferable alternative be provided in West Potomac Park at the former site of Washington Boat Tour's dock. This location is used periodically by DC Triathlon organizers for a swimming dock. At minimal expense, this site could be equipped with a floating dock and access ramp for cartop-carried kayaks, canoes and paddle boards. It is located immediately adjacent to the river's buoyed 6 mph speed area and just slightly downriver from Theodore Roosevelt Island. West Potomac Park has extensive on-street parking availability and would help spread out access points for river recreation without any interference with the visual experience of the monuments or Arlington Memorial Bridge.

Regarding recommendations for a boathouse at Site C in High and Medium density scenarios, while we would

support such a location, we are puzzled by a number of apparent inconsistencies. For example, the study in several places refers to the need for a 150 foot clear zone from a facility's farthest door under DC fire safety rules. That area would appear to be lacking in upriver (west) direction for Site C if developed. We would like to understand how compliance is proposed at this location. The Service also points to DC Water's proposal for an access point for new stormwater facility at Site C and says it does not agree. What is the Service's ability to dictate or deny options for DC Water to execute its court-mandated fix of the sewer overflow problem? Finally, the historic status of the Alexandria Aqueduct Bridge arch and Washington Canoe Club is cited repeatedly as a consideration in siting a new boathouse. The Study cites impairment of views of historic structures as an obstacle to siting a boathouse. How would a boathouse such as the one the Study proposes for Site C overcome such likely objections to impairing the public's ability to see these historic structures? Given this combination of factors, we wonder why Site C included as a viable location for a boathouse.

Conclusion

Eight prior studies since 1985 have looked at new boathouse facilities in Georgetown. Despite the many studies and the passage of nearly three decades, nothing has happened. No new boathouse space has been added. No locations for building a boathouse have been designated. During the same period, the rest of the Georgetown waterfront has been remarkably transformed. Major new buildings include the Washington Harbour complex, Swedish Embassy and adjacent new office building on site of former West End coal station. The Georgetown Waterfront Park has been created, and numerous buildings built along K and Water Streets, many of which border the historic C&O Canal National Historical Park and Rock Creek Park. All have gone from plan and public input to completion.

But time has stood still for those who need access to the river. Rowers and paddlers have, literally, lost space during the great rebuilding of the Georgetown waterfront: Rowers lost temporary boat storage at the former W.T. Gallier lumber yard to the Swedish Embassy and office building; paddlers lost the use of the Washington Canoe Club's boat bays and interior. During all this new development and these losses for the non-motorized boating community, the Service has continued to order up study after study with no forward progress obvious. We hope this Feasibility Study enables the Service to turn the page.

It is time for the Service to step up and lead. Having defined its Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone, the Service needs to be actively clearing the path so new facilities can be built. We think It should also take a fresh look at options for updating and expanding Thompson's Boat Center to better accommodate today's level of use. It might also take a look at low cost, high return options such as a modest boat dock at West Potomac Park. It needs to provide better opportunities to the increasing numbers who would like to actively experience the Nation's River from a boat they row or paddle, not from a car, bus, or bike or on foot.

As we at Potomac Boat Club prepare to celebrate our 144th anniversary, we look forward to welcoming new river shoreline neighbors. Let's work together to build appropriately on the rich history of boating in Georgetown to create an even more attractive and active riverscape, one that allows Washingtonians and visitors to directly and personally appreciate the nation's river.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Erik Meyers
Representative for the Potomac Boat Club
(Formerly, PBC President, 1983 -1989)
Copies

Edward Ryan, President
PBC Board of Governors
PBC Membership

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 28**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Thomas E. Lightfoot
Organization: C & O Canal Assoc.
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: tomlightfoot1@aol.com
Arlington, VA 22205
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/15/2013 Date Received: 05/15/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

A low impact approach to development (preferably outside the NHP) is the only activity that should be considered by the department. Development within the park should benefit all park users and should be overseen by the Park Service, usually in the form of overseeing a concessionaire.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 29**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Neal T. Fitzpatrick
Organization: Audubon Naturalist Society
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8940 Jones Mill Road
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
USA

E-mail: neal@audubonnaturalist.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New
Date Sent: 05/15/2013
Number of Signatures: 1
Contains Request(s): No
Notes:

Park Correspondence Log:
Date Received: 05/15/2013
Form Letter: No
Type: Web Form

Correspondence Text

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study

Audubon Naturalist Society (ANS) has about 6,000 members in the Washington metro area. ANS has used the C & O Canal National Historical Park as an outdoor environmental education classroom for many decades. In the 1950's our Society's publication, The Atlantic Naturalist, stated "the historic Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, with its Towpath, its bordering woods and the Potomac River has been Washington's most appreciated natural area for more than a century." Some of our Society's leaders walked with Justice William O. Douglas to call attention to the natural values of the canal, towpath, and river border.

ANS is a member of the Defenders of the Potomac River Parkland. We join members of that coalition in our support for the "Low Density" sceanrio because it best protects the national park and provides additional water recreation facilities outside the national park.

Our organization's chief concern is the protection of the natural values of the C&O Canal NHP. It is our view that there should be no private develoment in the national park. If new facilities are considered in the national park they should serve the park's mission (protecting environmental and historic values), serve the public, and be operated by NPS or a concessionaire.

Please find good locations for expanding water recreation opportunities outside of the national park.

Neal Fitzpatrick
Executive Director
Audubon Naturalist Society

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 30

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Nancy J. Orvis
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: PO Box 15242
Chevy Chase, MD 20825
USA
E-mail: norvis9@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/15/2013	Date Received: 05/15/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Hi,

I own my own recreational kayak and am 58 years old. I most emphatically endorse having a launching place for kayakers in Georgetown, as I often work in Rosslyn and I live in Chevy Chase, and for both physical and mental health reasons, wish to be able to get on the Potomac after work Spring through Fall, and on the weekends without having the stress of driving 30-50 miles to another water source. It is such a treasure to be on the water such as the Potomac, where one can see blue herons and bald eagles within a quarter mile of the Key Bridge -- truly a national and local treasure! It is very important to have a local launching site that is reachable with minimum driving, and which I as a single woman, would be able to maneuver my kayak to the water-- it would be even more wonderful if one could rent a seasonal pass for storing a kayak by the waters edge as well.

Again, I have been a resident of the Capital region since 1985 and believe access to the Potomac and the nature so close at hand, helps attract the best and brightest to a beautiful city. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 31

Author Information

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

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/15/2013	Date Received: 05/15/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I appreciate this opportunity to express my personal views on the Non-motorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study for the Georgetown waterfront. My hope is that the study will aid the National Park Service in developing positive policies for the area. The following are my comments:

Protection of the C&O Canal National Historical Park is fundamental. About half of the zone under study lies within the C&OCNHP, which was created by Congress to preserve historical and natural assets for today's public and for future generations. The goals of the NHP include recreation, but the location, type, and scale of recreational facilities should be appropriate to the park's overall character. The canal park's mission of preservation must not be compromised by development that unduly promotes a particular type of recreational interest.

Low Density is the only wholly feasible scenario because it respects the C&OCNHP. Besides providing increased boating access outside the NHP at Sites D and E, the Low Density plan allows boating-related improvements within the NHP that are appropriate and desirable. Public launching of small craft would be facilitated by an added pathway on the upriver side of the Washington Canoe Club (WCC) within Site A, and by a new dock on the downriver side of the WCC at Site C. Such improvements need not interfere with the ability of non-boating park visitors to enjoy the Capital Crescent Trail (CCT) and views of the river, wooded shoreline, and the Alexandria Aqueduct.

The Medium Density Scenario is not feasible because it includes a highly impractical new boathouse at Site A. Such a structure would severely downgrade park visitor experience in the area. Although described as "in scale" with the historic WCC, the footprint of the new building would exceed that of the WCC, judging from Figure 22. The new boathouse would block views of the river and wooded shoreline for users of the CCT. It would greatly increase pedestrian and vehicular traffic along a section of the trail that often very crowded by hikers, joggers, baby strollers, and fast-moving bicycles. Even if boaters were prohibited from using cars to bring their craft to the Site A boathouse, motor vehicles would be required to reach the building for maintenance and for fire safety. The first paragraph of the study's "Site Access" section on page 39 shows that this would mean widening part of the CCT to 20 feet, or constructing a parallel lane beside the trail. This required additional paving, and the proposed building itself, simply do not belong in this narrow space between the canal levee and the river.

The High Density Scenario would further damage the C&OCNHP by adding a large, intrusive storage building at Site C in addition to the new boathouse at Site A. The increase in crowding would be compounded by introducing this structure into an area that page 39 of the feasibility study correctly describes as a "Mixing Bowl" where multipurpose trails converge with vehicular traffic, resulting in safety concerns. This added rise in traffic would be the inevitable result of pedestrians and vehicles moving to and from a building that could hold as many as 85 multi-person craft, according to page 54. It's hard to imagine how there could be enough room for the roundabout mentioned on p. 50 as a way to safely integrate this traffic, or that such a feature would be an enhancement. In any case, park visitors walking or biking upriver through the Alexandria Aqueduct's archway would be confined between the canal levee and a row of riverside buildings for almost the whole way to past Site A. From the canal towpath above, the existing view of the historic aqueduct and of the river would be partly obstructed by a double-bay storage facility, joined on its upper level to create an overall length of 225 feet.

Private intrusion into the C&OCNHP should be explicitly prohibited. The land exchange authority granted by the legislation establishing the C&OCNHP was intended for enhancement of the canal park, not for creation of new private enclaves within it, something that also violates NPS policy. The High Density Scenario's storage building at Site C would be designed to house team rowing shells and provided with a 250-foot dock, a layout not unlike a potentially private academic boathouse. The Feasibility Study should make clear that a private facility is not an option within the canal park.

Excellent opportunities for new boating facilities exist outside of the C&OCNHP. While High and Medium Density development is unacceptable upriver from the Alexandria Aqueduct, that does not necessarily apply to the downstream part of the Boathouse Zone. The best place for development within the zone is Site E, where a well-designed multi-story boathouse (or even two such structures) could improve the shabby existing cityscape. Site E also provides easier vehicular access than any other location in the zone. The boating capacity of Site D could also

be enhanced, especially by using the space now occupied by three non-historic townhouses. Federal property in the downriver part of the Boathouse Zone need not be subject to the legal and policy restraints that rule out a land exchange involving the C&OCNHP. Completely urban in character, the downriver area is a patchwork of private and public ownership. Much of the property is under the jurisdiction of Rock Creek Park, but that land does not form part of a cohesive park environment.

Beyond the currently designated Boathouse Zone, other opportunities for increased boating access may be found downriver on both sides of the Potomac, as well as along the Anacostia. In considering all possibilities, NPS should remember that boating is only one of several forms of desirable recreation enjoyed by park users, and that scenic and historic preservation must be respected.

Sincerely,

Edmund (Ned) Preston
6306 Swords Way
Bethesda, Maryland

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 32**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert B. Norris
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3901 Cathedral Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016
Washington, DC 20016
USA
E-mail: Bob.Norris@LNF.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/16/2013 Date Received: 05/16/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

In order to promote transparency and to achieve a more acceptable resolution of the boathouse issues pertaining to the Georgetown Waterfront Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone, the National Park Service should provide answers to the following questions.

1. As an obvious "stakeholder" in the Feasibility Study process, did Georgetown University submit a written comment? And, if so, why was this comment not included in Appendix E, Public Comments?

2. As an obvious "stakeholder" in the Feasibility Study process, did George Washington University submit a written comment? And, if so, why was this comment not included in Appendix E, Public Comments?

3. As an obvious "stakeholder" in the Feasibility Study process, did Jack's Boathouse submit a written comment? And, if so, why was this comment not included in Appendix E, Public Comments?

4. I understand that George Washington University has been promised Site E by the Park Service and to advance its claim GW purchased two of the three townhouses (3524 and 3526 Water Street) at Site D which the University intends to convey to the Park Service in exchange for Site E. Is this understanding correct? If not, please clarify.

5. It is my understanding that the Park Service intends to purchase the third townhouse (3528 Water Street) at Site D. Is this correct? If not, please clarify.

6. I further understand that upon acquisition of the townhouse at 3528 Water Street, as well as the other two townhouses at 3524 and 3526 Water Street in a land exchange with GW for Site E, the Park Service will raze the three townhouses to increase the square footage of Site D for development. Is this correct? If not, please clarify.

May I suggest that the Park Service post these questions and answers on the appropriate website for the edification of the public.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B Norris

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 33**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Chris McGraw
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6445 Luzon Ave NW #318
Washington, DC 20012
USA
E-mail: chrismcgraw@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/16/2013 Date Received: 05/16/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To whom it may concern:

No new private development should be permitted within the C&O Canal NHPark at this time. Any new facilities within the park should serve the public and be operated by the National Park Service, either directly or through a concessionaire.

Team rowing facilities should be outside of the C&O Canal NHP. Any new facilities for multi-person racing shells should be outside the park.

The "Low Density" scenario is the only one of three described in the study that protects the natural, historic and cultural resources of the C&O Canal NHPark while providing new boating facilities at good locations outside the park.

Thanks for your work.

Sincerely,

Chris

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 34**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Eric Fisher
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Vienna, VA 22182
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/17/2013 Date Received: 05/17/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

- ? No development upriver of the Washington Canoe Club.
- ? No private boathouses anywhere.
- ? Strongly support additional boathouses.
- ? Study area is too restricted. Needs to extend to Rock Creek and include the other side of the river.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 35**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kay Rogers
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3110 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Unit 201
Washington, DC 20016
USA
E-mail: kayrogersunit@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/17/2013 Date Received: 05/17/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am really distressed to hear news of possible development along the beautiful Potomac River. The historic Canoe Club should be restored and Georgetown University should re-hab their existing boathouse. Other than that, the woods and riverbank should not be touched past the Canoe Club.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 36

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Dave Lepkowski
Organization: home
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2176 Glencourse Ln
2176 Glencourse Ln
Reston, VA 20191
USA
E-mail: Davelep@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/17/2013 Date Received: 05/17/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 38

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Dawn L. Rosenthal
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 39763 Rivers Edge Lane
Lovettsville, VA 20180
USA
E-mail: boxerdrool@msn.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/17/2013 Date Received: 05/17/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am very proud to say that I am an avid supporter of the National Park Service in general and specifically the C&O Canal by monetary donations, as a living historian volunteer and as the caretaker of 3 retired C&O Canal mules. As such, I am outraged that the NPS would consider the development of boathouse on NPS/C&O Canal property. The NPS must stand firm in its mission statement and adhere to the low density approach to any development on public property under NPS guardianship, especially where development will present a huge encumbrance on the visual astetices of a National Park, such as a boathouse built on the C&O Canal. This boathouse development does not serve a public interest and the development of which will only serve as a precedent for other private entities to take self serving advantage of public land(s).

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 39

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kerry J. Gruber
Organization: C & O Canal Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 125 Timberbrook Lane
Apt. 302
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
USA
E-mail: kerryknits@grubersbar.us

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/17/2013	Date Received: 05/17/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a third-generation Washingtonian, and have grown up using the C & O Canal towpath near the Georgetown waterfront. My grandparents and father lived in Burleith for many years, just north of Georgetown University. The area impacted by the joint Georgetown University and George Washington University development plan is quite familiar to me.

This waterfront area has been used and continues to be used by a wide variety of users - pedestrians, runners, hikers, bicyclists and non-motorized boaters. No one group has a monopoly on this area. There are restaurants that face out over the canal in this vicinity and thus have a view of the Potomac River. This is a crowded area that brings together a wide variety of people, particularly on weekends. The roads along the river are quite crowded and parking is scarce. None of the small roads leading down to the boathouse areas described can be widened to accommodate the turn-around area for large trucks bearing racks of boats.

The Georgetown Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study is written from the viewpoint of those people desiring to use the waterfront as extensively as possible with non-motorized boating. There is almost no consideration of the recreation needs of other users. Rowing, crewing, canoeing, and kayaking can be accomplished to a certain extent in the Georgetown Boathouse Zone but these users' needs should be balanced against the needs of the more general public that also uses this area.

I recommend the low density development plan, because this version is the best for balancing the needs of the general public against those of non-motorized boaters. There are alternative areas along both the Potomac River and the Anacostia River that can be developed to handle a higher volume of non-motorized boating for Georgetown University, George Washington University, and local high school boating teams than this crowded waterfront area. The Capital Crescent Trail and the C & O Canal towpath cannot be relocated.

How would the large trucks bearing racks of kayaks, rowboats, or canoes be able to turn around in this limited area? It is also not clear whether the high or medium density development plans allow for an adequate volume of parking to handle the number of users that would flock to the new facilities. One of the most popular times for these non-motorized boaters to use such boating facilities is during the morning and evening rush hour on weekdays, when the Whitehurst Parkway, Key Bridge, and M Street are quite busy with traffic.

The high and medium density development plans would allow for more special events and competitions that also add to the pressure on the roads in this area. It is not merely the direct users of the non-motorized boating that would go to the new boathouse facilities - such facilities also bring others to view events on the waterfront, such as the friends and families of competing teams, and the employees of the facilities.

It is also not at all clear what the impact is on users of the Capital Crescent Trail in the Boathouse Zone. How would joggers, hikers, and bicyclists be accommodated along with the users of these new boathouse facilities? When there are large numbers of people walking into or out of the boathouse facilities, does that mean that the Capital Crescent Trail is unavailable to others? How would such conflicts in traffic be managed?

To a lesser extent, the same type of concern goes for users of the C & O Canal towpath - those recreational users are going to be traversing a small part of the same area as the boating users, and it is not clear how the competing traffic would be managed. The canal towpath is already subject to erosion from foot and bicycle traffic, and the occasional flood. The National Park Service would be responsible for maintaining that section of the towpath where boathouse users cross it; has the additional traffic been taken into account?

The unique character of the Georgetown waterfront deserves to be open to a wide variety of recreational users and not monopolized for any one type of recreation.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 40

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Erik Meyers
Organization: Potomac River Sports Foundation
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: c/o Nossaman LLP, 1666 K Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006
USA
E-mail: erikjmeyers@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/18/2013 Date Received: 05/18/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The Potomac River Sports Foundation, founded as a non-profit corporation in 1972 under the laws of the District of Columbia and recognized by the Internal Revenue Service as a tax exempt charitable organization, is pleased to submit these comments on the Georgetown Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study.

The Foundation was organized to foster rowing and other paddle sports in the greater Washington, DC metropolitan area. During its 40 year existence, the Foundation has helped to provide assistance to athletes, coaches and programs aspiring to succeed at national and international levels. It has helped provide support for the transportation and other expenses to athletes competing in the Olympics in rowing, sculling and canoeing events; Pan American Games; World Rowing Championships; Royal Henley Regatta, US National Rowing and US National Canoe and Kayak championship regattas and helped local teams at the Potomac Boat Club, Washington Canoe Club, Thompson's Boat Center, and Occoquan Boat Club with new training equipment and other forms of support. Understanding the region's long history in competitive rowing and canoeing, we are advocates for new generations of athletes seeking to develop their skills and perform at the highest levels in these sports.

We support the designation of the NMBZ and the addition of new boathouses at all sites (A, C, D & E - in other words, the High Density option with caveats as noted in these comments) where none currently exist. We support the renovation and return of boats into the bays of the Washington Canoe Club facility, and access to those docks for walk-in users with canoes and kayaks.

The Washington area, despite extensive river frontage, currently provides minimal access to the Potomac for non-motorized boating. The area's only rowing facilities, Thompson's and Potomac BC, are extremely crowded. It stands to reason that unmet demand exists since the last boathouse built on the upper tidal Potomac was Thompson's in 1960. The metro region has expanded significantly in the intervening half century and, as modern environmental laws and programs cleaned up the Potomac River and waterfront, more people than ever seek outdoor recreational opportunities on the river. Dozens of new programs have started rowing during this period throughout the metropolitan region, many drawn by location to the upper tidal Potomac.

While we recognize that thought needs to be given to managing land-based activities through the NMBZ, such as pedestrian and bicycle use, we see this small area as essential and without reasonable alternatives to serving the growing rowing and paddling population. The National Park Service has indicated that expansion of the Thompson's facility is not part of its current plan and does not indicate any other areas that it would deem suitable for boathouses, thus we conclude and urge very strongly that water-dependent uses in the NMBZ requiring a shoreline location to access the River be given significant priority over land-based activities. In our opinion, there are alternatives readily available for those land-based activities, and they can reasonably be made compatible with a slight increase in numbers of boathouses on the shoreline. We note in particular that proposed collegiate boathouses would serve student athletes who live on nearby District campuses and would be arriving on foot or by bicycle to these locations. The presence of these boathouses in the NMBZ would not add significantly to the volume of vehicular traffic on Water/K Streets or interfere with bike and pedestrian uses.

Given our experience with both rowing and paddling sports in the region, we would say that rowing is the most underserved in terms of facilities. Team rowing shells average 40 feet up to 65 feet in length. They are made of materials that degrade if exposed to the elements for long periods, and are not easily carried on a daily basis to a launch area. In contrast, the Washington Canoe Club has a relatively small number of competitive paddlers at all age levels. The WCC facility is complemented by rental facilities and private racks at Jack's Boats, Thompson's and Fletcher's. Rowers have only Thompson's or Potomac Boat Club, both at capacity or greater. For these reasons, we do not support using site A or C for a new canoe/ paddle sport-only(i.e., canoe, kayak, paddleboard, dragon boat) facility, believing that those users can readily be accommodated at existing facilities, in particular by a restored Washington Canoe Club, which owned and operated by NPS.

The National Park Service has conducted a substantial number of studies of where and how to add more rowing boathouses. We believe this Feasibility Study needs to put in place a strong assumption of the viability of new rowing facilities at each of the 4 new locations (A, C, D, and E) and restoring and expanding use of WCC for paddling at site B.

In the future, we would encourage the Service to consider renovations and expansion opportunities at the Thompson's Boat Center, including better use of surface parking and underused grassy and gravel areas along Rock Creek Parkway for new boathouses. We also think the Service could creatively rethink the current mix of passive and active uses of waterfront in West and East Potomac Parks where more opportunities for paddling access could easily be accomplished with the addition of relatively low cost floating docks or put-in ramps cut into the existing seawalls. However, for the moment, we urge the Service to settle on this NMBZ and allow long-overdue and reasonable requests for new rowing boathouses to proceed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
Erik Meyers, President, Potomac River Sports Foundation

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 41**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: James P. Lynch
Organization: Several
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8263 Oakwood Dr.
King George, VA 22485
USA
E-mail: jplynch@crosslink.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/18/2013 Date Received: 05/18/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Hi and thanks for the opportunity to comment. I may submit additional comments later.

1. I'm very supportive of the non-motorized boathouse zone along the Georgetown waterfront.
2. I do have a concern that the scope of the zone is too limited. I would like to see it extended from Memorial Bridge upriver to the fall line.
3. I noted on one map that the Mount Vernon trail was shown, but not the Potomac Heritage Trail on the Virginia side. The PHT extends from Key Bridge to Chain Bridge. It should also be shown on the map for completeness.

Thank you.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 42**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Nicholas M. Davies
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 848 W Glebe Road

Alexandria, VA 22305
USA

E-mail: nick_m_davies@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/18/2013 Date Received: 05/18/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to voice support for the NPS plan for further analysis for development of a non-motorized boathouse zone along the Georgetown waterfront. The rowing community is desperately short of resources in the DC area - with Thompson Boat Center being the last constructed boathouse over 50 years ago. At the time, there were only 3 school rowing programs in the area and that has expanded tenfold since then, but with no additional boating areas.

I would strongly encourage further review and development of the sites to support non-motorized boating areas along the Potomac.

Yours faithfully,
Nick Davies

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 43

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Jill Finsen
Organization: Potomac Boat Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3900 Connecticut Ave NW
 304F
 Washington, DC 20008
 USA
E-mail: jillfinsen@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/19/2013 Date Received: 05/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have been rowing in the Washington DC community for almost twenty years. Rowing is one of the highlights of my life. It is how I start most days in a city with two rivers but not much activity centered around the rivers except if one has the privilege to be on one of them.

There has been increasing demand on the rowing community. My boathouse always maintains a waiting list for interested rowers. Establishing another boathouse would alleviate the wait some rowers must sustain to enjoy being on the river on a regular basis.

The rowing footprint is an environmentally responsible one. We are interested in sustainability for the environment and enjoying the gift of the river and wildlife. And it also contributes to maintaining a healthy lifestyle.

I hope the Park Services will see its way to permitting additional facilities for rowing and other non-motorized activities. Thank you for considering my comments.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 44

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Elisabeth R. Greco
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6417 Kenhowe Drive
Bethesda , MD 20817
USA
E-mail: ottimista_eterna@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/19/2013 Date Received: 05/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposal to build a large boathouse inside the C&O Canal National Historical Park.

This beautiful public park and the flora and fauna that live within are already facing a range of serious threats linked to their proximity to developed urban areas. Building a large public structure inside the park would further compromise this already at-risk area.

There is no justification for allowing further private development within the C&O Canal National Historical Park. Any new structures inside the park should serve the public at large and be operated by our National Park Service.

Situating team-rowing facilities inside the C&O Canal NHP would subject the park's delicate ecosystem to a daily onslaught of additional noise and human activity. Any new facilities for multi-person racing hulls should be created outside the park and the public area it protects.

I support and urge you to adopt the "low density" scenario as it is the only one of three described in the study that protects the natural resources of the park as well as scenic views.

A large, intrusive private structure such as those described in scenarios 1 and 2 has no place in this extremely important and all-too-rare public space. It would further compromise and threaten natural resources in the park and boost congestion on the already crowded Capital Crescent Trail.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 45**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert D. Rakes
Organization: C&O Canal Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: PO Box 366
Glen Echo, MD 20812 0366
McLean, VA 22101
USA
E-mail: bobrakes@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/19/2013 Date Received: 05/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Sirs and Madames

I am against the use of the US Parkland for any purpose that does not permit the general public to participate in its use or the right to move on and off the property. The Georgetown U wants to build a private boat house for the use of its private members and to exclude the general public. Shame on Georgetown U.

Let Georgetown U build its boathouse to fit the land it already owns or on land it can purchase from non Parkland holders.

Georgetown U is using influential attorneys and self interest groups to wear down the supporters of the public interest. I hope they are not successful and I hope the Park Service is strong-willed enough to dismiss them and stand up for the general public and the citizen users of the C&O Canal and the C&O canal trail

Sincerely,

Robert D. Rakes

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 46**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Sean Durkin
Organization: Potomac Boat Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2711 Wisconsin Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail: seanwdurkin@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/19/2013 Date Received: 05/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Hello,

I agree that a non-motorized zone on the Georgetown Waterfront would help promote more usage of the water by more people. I think that motorized boats provide recreational activities for few where canoes, kayaks, rowing boats, stand up paddle boards and other craft let more people enjoy the water with less impact to others. In addition, non-motorized craft also create less environmental impact and are quieter.

The use of motorized launches are useful to coach non-motorized craft, perhaps they can be powered by electric motors to lessen the environmental impact.

Sincerely,

Sean Durkin

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 47

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Catherine F. Cleland
Organization: WeCanRow DC
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 9506 Culver Street
Kensington, MD 20895
USA
E-mail: tinacleland@comcast.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/19/2013 Date Received: 05/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

WeCanRow DC (WCR) is a volunteer directed, not for profit, educational and support organization offering breast cancer survivors an introduction to the sport of sweep rowing, and continuing recreational and competitive rowing opportunities. Our organization rows out of Potomac Boat Club and we strongly support the approval of a nonmotorized boathouse zone along the Georgetown waterfront. Nonmotorized boats, such as Rowing shells, offer participants moments of peaceful enjoyment on the river surrounded by gorgeous scenery and abundant bird life. Motorized boats disrupt the peace of the environment and they disturb the water for nonmotorized boats. Even though no-wake zones have been designated, some boats do not honor this restriction. Also, the motorized pleasure boats anchored along the Georgetown waterfront near the boathouses block traffic and obstruct views of other nonmotorized boats crossing a course. This is a dangerous intrusion.

Please designate a long stretch of the Georgetown waterfront as a nonmotorized zone.

Thank you,
Tina Cleland
President, WeCanRow DC

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 48

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Diane D. Taylor
Organization: We Can Row
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address: 3254 Valley Lane
Falls Church, VA 22044
Falls Church, VA 22044
USA
E-mail: dianedtaylor@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/19/2013 Date Received: 05/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I favor the accommodation of more rowing, relief from crowding at Thompson's and construction of more capacity to enjoy the Potomac River. I work in DC and treasure the gift of the river as a respite from the city to access nature so close at hand. I support any action to this end.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 49

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Catherine Cleland
Organization: WeCanRow DC
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 9506 Culver Street
Kensington, MD 20895
USA
E-mail: tinacleland@comcast.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/19/2013 Date Received: 05/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

WeCanRow DC is supporting medium density development of the Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. We are concerned about parking issues in all scenarios, but this is most serious for the high density development scenario. The low density scenario does not develop Site A which is calling out for a boathouse.

The medium density option will increase the capacity for indoor training and outdoor recreational and competitive rowing as well as storage of rowing shells larger than singles.

Thank you,
Catherine F. (Tina) Cleland
President, WeCanRow DC

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 50**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22314
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/19/2013 Date Received: 05/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am for it.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 51**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VT 22304
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/19/2013 Date Received: 05/19/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have rowed the DC area since 2005. I support the 2 second plan/medium density for development because parking for anyone who uses any of these rowing venues is parking.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 52

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert B. Norris
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3901 Cathedral Ave. N.W.
 Washington, D.C. 20016
 Washington, DC 20016
 USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/20/2013 Date Received: 05/20/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Reference is made to the questions for the Park Service submitted as a comment on 5/16/13 (Comment ID 856255-53024/32). Here's another question for the Park Service.

7. I understand that the Park Service has entered into a two-year concession contract with B&G Outdoor Recreation, Inc., that is currently operating at Site D as Key Bridge Boathouse. Would this contract preclude relocating Key Bridge Boathouse from Site D to Site C, now or after two years? Please amplify

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 53

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert B. Norris
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3901 Cathedral Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016
Washington, DC 20016
USA
E-mail: Bob.Norris@LNF.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/20/2013 Date Received: 05/20/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Reference is made to the questions for the Park Service submitted as a comment on 5/16/13. Here's another question for the Park Service.

7. I understand that the Park Service has entered into a two-year concession contract with B&G Outdoor Recreation, Inc., which is currently operating at Site D as Key Bridge Boathouse. Would this contract preclude relocating Key Biidge Boathouse from Site D to Site C now or after two years? Please amplify.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 54

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Tatjana M. Meerman
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 10841 Whiterim Dr.
Potomac, MD 20854
USA
E-mail: tatmeer@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/20/2013 Date Received: 05/20/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a new rower, I find current accommodations extremely crowded and therefore favor the development of additional sites to provide more capacity.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 55

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Carlton Cusey
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2601 Woodley Road
Washington, DC 20008
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/20/2013 Date Received: 05/20/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The waterfront should be reserved for it's rightful residents: rats, homeless people, and garbage. Why on earth should we clean it up with a pristine boathouse that will help DC build a waterfront to rival Philadelphia and Boston?

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 56

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: David E. Winer
Organization: Defenders of Potomac River Parkland
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Bethesda, MD 20816
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/20/2013 Date Received: 05/20/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The low density plan is feasible for providing much needed boating facilities for the public and universities. Other plans will certainly receive strong opposition from the public.

Site E is ideally located for new boathouse construction. It has never been the subject of open public review. Site A, in the C&O National Historical Park, must be protected from development--attempts by NPS to consider private development have been hotly contested by the public and many organizations. Such opposition will certainly continue and will no doubt succeed in the end.

I note that NPS still considers "proposals for one or more land exchanges for boathouses." If such an exchange is made, the TRUE VALUE of the properties to be exchanged must be comparable--in contrast to earlier notions regarding Georgetown University's miniscule sliver of riverbank upstream proposed in exchange for an exceedingly valuable property in the Park.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 57**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Susan Green
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3515 36th Street, NW
 Washington, DC 20016
 Washington , DC 20016
 USA
E-mail: sgreend@earthlink.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/20/2013 Date Received: 05/20/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a kayaker who owns her own kayak and would like to speak in favor of a public car-top launch site in the nonmotorized boathouse zone. Many paddlers, such as myself, own our own kayaks and store them at our homes. Therefore, in conjunction with such a launch site, parking close to the launch site is absolutely necessary. Kayakers could apply for annual parking permits for a limited fee, so that the lot would not be used for general Georgetown Waterfront parking.

This concept seems to be in keeping with Development Scenario 2 - Medium Density, assuming that the boat launch described for Site A and the Parking described for Site C would be available for kayakers who are not members of the Washington Canoe Club.

Kayaking members of the public really only need: 1) a very inexpensive launch site (even a sandy beach will do); 2) parking nearby that does not cost \$25/day; and 3) and toilet facilities.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 58**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: larry mills
Organization: C & O Canal Assn
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: #1515
true
Olympia, WA 98501-1131
USA
E-mail: larrymills36@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/20/2013 Date Received: 05/20/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Though I live in Washington State, I've been a user of the C & O Canal NP for a number of years.

I strongly oppose the projected boathouse that Georgetown U. wishes to build on a portion of the Park and towpath.

Why can't GU build the boathouse downstream from the Park? And why should a private entity be allowed to take valuable recreational land from the general public?

My concerns will also be transmitted to my Senators and Representative.

Thank you.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 59**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Peter J. Bautz
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 821 Water Place
Alexandria, VA 22314
USA
E-mail: crewlaxbautz@comcast.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/20/2013 Date Received: 05/20/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a former rower and rowing coach for both Georgetown University and Potomac Boat Club, I wholeheartedly support the general conclusion of NPS's Feasibility Study for the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone on the Georgetown waterfront - that future rowing boathouses should be located on the Potomac River in Georgetown. While I might quibble regarding whether the boathouses should be at the eastern end of the Zone or west of Key Bridge (my preference), the most important point is that new boathouses be permitted on the Potomac in Georgetown.

My reasons for supporting additional boathouses in the Zone include:

- Rowing has a long and storied history on the Potomac, dating back well over 120 years;
- During the past 120 or so years, other boathouses once dotted the Georgetown waterfront, and many were found within the Zone;
- The popularity of rowing at all levels on the Potomac in Georgetown - high school, college, club - and for both recreational and competitive purposes - has grown exponentially over the last 25 years, but boathouse space has not increased, severely straining existing facilities;
- Space at existing facilities in Georgetown - Thompson's and Potomac - is so limited that shells are stored outdoors, exposed to both the elements and possible vandalism;
- More boathouses will provide even greater access to the sport for enthusiasts and newcomers of all ages and income levels; and
- The beauty of the sport adds to the aesthetic appeal of the waterfront in Georgetown.

The need for additional boathouse space is acute. I enthusiastically support the Study's conclusion that future rowing boathouses should be located on the Potomac River in Georgetown.

Sincerely,

Peter J. Bautz

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 60

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Andrew G. Soles
Organization: Washington Canoe Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: PO Box 25449
Washington DC 20027
Washington DC, WA 20007
USA
E-mail: president@washingtoncanoeclub.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

COMMENTS OF THE WASHINGTON CANOE CLUB ON THE GEORGETOWN WATERFRONT NONMOTORIZED BOATHOUSE ZONE FEASIBILITY STUDY ? MAY 2013

The Board of the Washington Canoe Club appreciates the careful consideration of the many years of input and many viewpoints on this zone, which are for the most part well reflected in this final feasibility study. Our comments:

- 1) We generally support the Low Density scenario.
- 2) We appreciate the prominence the study gives to the restoration of the historic WCC; all three development scenarios list this. We believe, though, that the appropriate term for the future of the WCC is "restoration" of this nationally-recognized historic structure, not "reconstruction" which used in the study.
- 3) We are concerned that the sensitive natural, historic, and cultural resources within the C&O Canal NHP be fully protected. Only the Low Density scenario assures this. The Medium and High Density scenarios would allow for some development upstream of WCC.
- 4) Congestion and conflicting uses at the trailhead Capital Crescent Trail and the Aqueduct Arch currently create a logistical nightmare and serious safety concerns. . The Low and Mid-Density solutions begin to address these concerns, but the High Density solution would exacerbate the issue by building additional boat houses and introducing more users west of the Arch.
- 5) The study needs to acknowledge that vehicle access and parking for the WCC for special events and boat drop-off

are essential to club viability. We support the parking proposed in the Low and Mid-density options. Even a modest amount of new parking would help alleviate a critical shortage for those users of Jack's, PBC, and WCC (and any new facilities) for which public or self-propelled transportation is simply not an option. NPS should also be working with the city (for both the short-term - during the duration of the Feasibility Study - and long-term) to make additional parking available along Water St.

6) Though we do not favor either high or medium scenarios, we support the concept of more daily boat rental space in site A/ However, we do not believe additional private boat storage at the proposed facility is needed as WCC, PBC, and Thompsons each offer and will continue to have considerable capacity to meet this need.

7) WCC would like to see a substantial public bathroom facility included as part of the final design/plan, similar to the installation at Fletcher's boathouse. For many years, right up to the present, WCC is the default bathroom facility for users of the Capital Crescent Trail and other waterfront users, straining our limited facilities (which are currently just one porta-john).

8) We are pleased that all three scenarios insure that recreational use of the Potomac corridor by a diverse user group ? paddlers, high school and collegiate rowing programs, and bicyclists and pedestrians - will be improved.

9) We are very disappointed to see on p. 21 so few of our recommendations for paddling facilities (which we submitted to NPS on 3/29/12 as our comments on the NMBZ Study) included in the list of "Desired Features of Paddling Facilities". There were at least 8 significant points we raised which are not reflected here and should be, to give full picture of what is need in paddling facilities. We would be happy to resubmit those.

10) We continue to think that the absence of Thompsons Boat Center from this study and consideration of boating facilities on this part of the Potomac is a serious error; to make this study comprehensive and realistic, the capability of the Thompsons site (including possibly constructing a larger facility) is essential

Corrections and Question:

- P 10 (also p. 47) ? the report incorrectly states "?Washington Canoe Club (the building and land are owned by the NPS)". The WCC does not dispute the ownership of the land, but the ownership of the building remains in question. NPS and WCC have been cooperating on a couple of projects recently while leaving the issue of building ownership not fully resolved.

- P 26 ? the report incorrectly states that the WCC structure was built in 1896. WCC records and history date the beginning of construction on the structure as 1904 or 1905; some accounts have the building completed in a year or two, others list the building as being completed in 1915.

- P. 27 - Correction needed: the photo on page 27 is probably not the WCC as: a) the building has not turrets, which we believe were part of the original architecture, and b) the building was built between 1904-1915, well after the "1890's" listed in the caption.

- Page 60 - We are confused by the statement on p. 60 (as part of the "medium density" scenario): "Site A could be developed as an expansion of the operation of the Washington Canoe Club structure with parking and drop-off provided on Site C for both sites." WCC has always operated as a volunteer run community paddling club. What change in operation is contemplated? Have conversations occurred, or will they occur, with WCC on what this option might mean? Will WCC have input into a decision on this?

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 61

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: N/A N/A

Organization:

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

Williston Park, NY 11596
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013	Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 62

Author Information

Keep Private:	No
Name:	Anne Goodrich
Organization:	
Organization Type:	I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:	1597 Greenwood Avenue Calistoga, CA 94515 USA
E-mail:	annegoodrich@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013	Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I participated in the rowing program at Georgetown in the 1980's and it was a formative experience for me, not only from an athletic perspective, but it gave me a unique appreciation of the

waterfront, the Potomac River and the surrounding wildlife. After reviewing the Feasibility Study, I like all sites (A, C, D and E) identified for rowing boathouses. I also support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as practicable to designate sites for both Georgetown University and George Washington University. Georgetown University's history on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline dates back well into the 19th century and is a defining element of the university's character. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone, so it seems as if this issue can be resolved without delay. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted and wasteful.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 63**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Michael G. Furgueson
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 36 E Main Street
Mendham, NJ 07945
USA
E-mail: mgfurgueson@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Sir/Madam

"I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I strongly support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. I am a rower, having rowed for Georgetown as well as to the present day. Boathouses most definitely enhance the character of a city while having a minimal/low intensity impact upon the environment. Look at cities such as Philadelphia, Boston, and London as prime examples. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted. Both projects are also very positive for the economic and jobs environment, as you have at least two Universities ready to spend significant funds creating new sustainable infrastructure. It is time to move forward, without delay.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 64**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Walter Barber
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Oak Brook, IL 60523
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The purpose of these comments is to support the proposed approval of additional rowing facilities as proposed by Georgetown University. Rowing provides an excellent opportunity for high school and college students in the Washington, D.C. area and the proposed facility would enhance these opportunities for these young people with little or no adverse impact on the river, the park land or the park users.

As a former member of the Potomac Boat Club and as a former rowing coach for both JEB Stuart H.S. and Georgetown University, I am personally familiar with the location and the activities at the existing rowing facilities. I am a registered Professional Civil Engineer in Washington, D.C. and received a Master's Degree in Water Resources Management from Catholic University.

The approval and subsequent development of the proposed additional rowing facility in the Key Bridge area would enhance the recreational opportunities for many people with virtually no adverse impact on the land based users of the Park Facilities. The students using the facilities would not cause any significant increase in vehicular traffic or parking demand since almost all of the students would walk or cycle to the boathouse.

I encourage the NPS to approve the proposed rowing facility for the benefit of the youth and with no significant adverse impact on the Park or the users of the land based facilities.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 65

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Paul S
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The historical basis of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline dates back well into the 19th century. Georgetown and George Washington have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. Given that there have been eight prior studies consuming approximately thirty years time, further studies would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 68

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: rory quirk
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3701 corey place nw
washington, DC 20016
USA
E-mail: roryquirk@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support the Boathouse Zone concept. Do not have enough of a background to weigh the relative merits of the discrete sites in the Zone. Whatever site the Service designates in the Zone is fine.

I run on the Towpath and canoe on the Canal. I grew up in Philadelphia, where Boathouse Row on the East River Drive is one of the centerpieces of the Schuylkill riverbank.

Now that the Waterfront Park is in place on the Potomac, the Zone would be a welcome next step.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 69

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: P Heifetz
Organization: Georgetown University alumnus
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

Philadelphia, PA 19072
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear National Park Service:

I graduated from Georgetown University in 1987, the same year that the feasibility of a boathouse began to be assessed in earnest. I was a member of the crew team all four years, and I felt an immense bond with the river and its surroundings during that time. I am very pleased to hear that this study is finally complete. Although I am no longer resident there, I wanted to comment that all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses are excellent and would be a very important and eco-friendly addition to the waterfront. I strongly support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 70

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Elizabeth Dennison
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2250 N. Triphammer Rd
 Apt G4
 Ithaca, NY 14850
 USA
E-mail: elizabeth.dennison@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Rowing and other nonmotorized boats is growing every year in the DC area, and the current boathouses are over capacity. The establishment of this zone and boathouses for Georgetown and GW will help create more space that is desperately needed for people to enjoy the area along the Potomac in a way that benefits the entire community and city- for people affiliated and not affiliated with the universities.

As someone who has rowed for Georgetown, coached for multiple programs in the DC area, and been a resident who has enjoyed the Potomac, Canal paths and more- this would be something that would great enhance the area and provide enjoyment for a number of people. In no way would this detract from use of the canal paths and other areas for anyone- the general public will benefit.

This has been studied thoroughly and it is now time to act.

Thank you for your consideration.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 71**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Geoff A. Sonn
Organization: School of Medicine at UCLA
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 409 N Orange Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90036
USA
E-mail: geoffsonn@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a former Georgetown rower (1997-2001). It was the beauty of the Potomac and the appeal of spending time out on the river and along its banks that attracted me to rowing in the first place. I was told early in my time at

Georgetown that the boathouse would be completed by the time I finished at Georgetown. Clearly this is not the case. As great as my experience was with Georgetown crew, it would be much better for future generations of rowers to have a new boathouse. This would only add to the beauty of the Potomac.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 72**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kim C. Speegle
Organization: Citizen
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 117 Clinton Road
Bedford Hills, NY 10507
USA
E-mail: kimspeegle@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

30 more years of study of this issue -- seems excessive. I am in full support of adding boat houses to the Potomac for both universities. like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 73**

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Brian P. Gallagher
Organization: Bank of America Merrill Lynch
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 261 Cervantes Blvd
San Francisco, CA 94111
USA
E-mail: bpgallagher26@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To Whom it May Concern,

I am an alumni of Georgetown University and former member of the University's varsity heavyweight crew team. Rowing at Georgetown was an incredibly positive experience for me and I am writing to express my support for moving forward with building a boathouse for Georgetown.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brian Gallagher
Georgetown MSB'10

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 74

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Chicago, IL 60614
USA

Boathouse Zone. More studies after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

As a resident of Georgetown for four years, it has been remarkable to see the waterfront transform from a forgotten piece of the city into the wonderful park it is today. Please continue the advancement and development of this treasured piece of our nation's capital. I support permitting Georgetown University to swap its existing valuable shoreline property for a site in the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 76

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Matthew J. Sippel
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
New York, NY 10024
USA
E-mail: msippel@induscap.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 77

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Sara Paulson
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address: 4434 Q St, NW
Washington, DC 20007
Washington, DC 20007
USA

E-mail: sarapaulson@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a long time resident of the District of Columbia who is an active user of the Capital Crescent Trail for biking and walking. I am very concerned that a new private development will have a negative effect on the trail and the C&O Canal Park more broadly. This is a unique feature of our city, one that offers a wide range of people a place of quiet and beauty and recreation. Please do not allow it to be compromised. I do not support ANY new private development within the C&O Canal Park. I would only support a carefully considered facility that serves the general public and which is operated directly by the NPS or a well vetted concessionaire.

Thus the "Low Density" scenario is the only one of the three scenarios on the study that I support.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 78

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Erik Hess
Organization: Alum of Georgetown University Crew
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 10 Hanover Square -19W
New York, NY 10005
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

During my years as student-athlete rowing at Georgetown I took great pride in representing my university, my DC community, and the great traditions of rowing on the Potomac. It's not always the quietest water, but with DC's incredible landmarks and architecture it is certainly a beautiful place to row.

I believe Washington DC's Potomac waterfront would be significantly further improved if more boathouses were authorized for construction in sites A, C, D, or E (as indicated in the study).

Philadelphia's Boathouse Row has positively defined and purposed the Schuylkill River for generations. Washington DC should do the same and allow Georgetown and GW to build boathouses on the Potomac without further delay and more studies. Both universities are willing to exchange valuable waterfront property they own to build and operate within the sites controlled by the National Park Service.

Please allow our universities to build on these sites and compete on the national stage: I have every confidence that Georgetown and GW will represent the District of Columbia community well.

Best,
Erik Hess

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 79

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Christine L. Bray
Organization: Alumni: Georgetown University Rowing Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2149 Sunset Circle
Largo, FL 33774
Largo, FL 33774
USA
E-mail: christinebray@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a former student and rower from Georgetown University, SLL 82, and there has been talk since I was a student, over thirty years ago, of building a boathouse for crew members. I think it is about time studies were over and a boathouse is built.

This seems like a long time to wait.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Sincerely,
Christine L. Bray

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 80

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Dan Smuts
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1510 Stannage Ave
Berkeley, CA 94702
USA
E-mail: dansmuts@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

From 1990 to 1992, I rowed for Georgetown University out of Thompson boathouse. My rowing experience at Georgetown had many positive outcomes including many life-long friendships, good physical and mental health, the pride of accomplishment, and the fellowship of being part of a team.

Having rowed in high school in Pittsburgh, PA and on many other water bodies up and down the east coast at various collegiate regattas, I can say without hesitation that the Potomac is one of the best non-motorized boating rivers, both in terms of water and wind conditions as well as sheer beauty.

Rowing has a long and storied place in the history of Washington, DC and Georgetown in particular. That history should be celebrated and enhanced, and current recreational demand met, through the designation of the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and the selection of the high density alternative.

After 30 years of study, the NPS should move forward on this designation and development and not delay action any further.

I would also encourage the NPS to undertake a land exchange with Georgetown University so Georgetown can build a boathouse within the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and the NPS can acquire an important upstream site and associated easement from Georgetown University.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and again, I encourage selection of the High Density alternative.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 81**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Yi Tsai
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Westport, CT 06880
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 82**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Alison E. Dilworth
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
4209 Cordell St.
Annandale, VA 22003
USA
E-mail: crdilworth@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013	Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I rowed at Georgetown University when I attended as an undergraduate student. My experiences as a rower are some of my most treasured memories of university and I fully support any plan that allows GU and GW students to continue rowing.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Sincerely, Alison Dilworth

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 83

Author Information

Keep Private:	No
Name:	Derek B
Organization:	Current Georgetown rower, former high school rower out of tbc
Organization Type:	I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:	Washington, DC 20011 USA
E-mail:	Derek.boyse@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013	Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

As someone who has gone through Thompsons boat center as both a collegiate and high school rower, I know the place quite well. As with anyone who loves something, it brings me great joy to see the increasing popularity of the

sport in Washington. New programs seem to be growing to sizes never imagined, taking kids off their coaches and putting them into a boat where they learn about teamwork and how to push themselves past anything they thought physically possible. It seems obvious that it is in everyone's interest to not impede the growth of such a wonderful sport in our city. Why prevent kids from experiencing the outdoors because there are too few boathouses to row out of? Granted, my viewpoint is biased, but I see so much potential for the development of a fantastic waterfront atmosphere in Washington that would bring to joy and benefit to many. From what I have heard, this is the 8th study that has been put together. This doesn't, to me, seem to be the best use of valuable park service resources. Please give myself and my high school friends the opportunity to better use the Potomac as a way to interact with nature in the concrete jungle that we seem to be living in today.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 84

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Ryan Lundquist
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4 carlson court
norwalk, CT 06855
USA
E-mail: ryanknapp.lundquist@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 85

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Vincent E. Gallagher
Organization: Graduate: Georgetown University College 65

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 364 Cedar Hill
Greenwich, CT 06830
USA
E-mail: vegallagher@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I was in the College when we started the rowing program in 1963. It is a great sport and it has been a great program for the University. I still remember the crowd when the varsity rowed against Ratzburg, the German crew who were the defending Olympic Champions.

Thus, when the University, about 20 plus years ago said that they wanted to raise money for a Georgetown Boathouse, I was a supporter. I hope than whenever it does get built folks will remember that I contributed \$25,000.00 for the Women's lockers. That seems like a very long time ago and I can appreciate that the National Conservancy and others were rightfully concerned back then that such "boathouse" be done properly.

Given the fact that there have been seven or eight studies to arrive at the current proposal, I do not believe that we need another. I believe that the University is willing to work within the framework outlined in the current study and I would certainly love to see a Georgetown Boathouse in my lifetime.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent E. Gallagher
College 65

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 86

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Andrew H. Southern
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 125 Wood Road
Los Gatos, CA 95030
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013	Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have read the Georgetown Waterfront Park NMBZ Feasibility Study very carefully. It is obvious that the various participants have worked hard to produce a complete and interesting review that does a great job of laying out the opportunities, constraints and alternatives.

The result is a convincing case in favor of proceeding with plans for any of sites A, C, D or E and I urge that decisions are taken rapidly in favor of the development of a modern solution for Georgetown University and George Washington University. I cannot imagine that further study will change the conditions already studied or reveal a solution not previously thought of. It is however certain that the present unsatisfactory conditions of College Rowing on the Potomac will not improve by themselves.

I say this as a rower of 50 years standing who has had the privilege of rowing in Europe in high school and college, and in the United States since then. The Potomac is the equal in both location and on-water quality of any rowing venue I have known from Oxford, Cambridge or Henley in the UK to the West Coast of America. It deserves to have the facilities to match its quality, that respect the setting and context, and that provide the support and space that high school, college and adult rowers need. Doing this will enhance the experience of rowers of all ages and will continue to provide a calm athletic backdrop to all visitors to one of the finest urban rowing sites of the world.

In the interests of full disclosure, my daughter is a Senior at Georgetown and a long time rower herself.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 87

Author Information

Keep Private:	No
Name:	Frank H. Benson
Organization:	Occoquan Boat Club and Potomac Boat Club
Organization Type:	I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:	6846 Boot Court Lorton, VA 22079 USA
E-mail:	fhbenson@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013	Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

The comments in this letter are in support of the proposed Georgetown Waterfront Boathouse Zone. The planning and comments for this concept for many years has been extensive and well thought out by many knowledgeable individuals.

Since the 1960's, I have been a rower and a coach on the Potomac River and have witnessed, as has the Park Service, the enormous growth of recreational and competitive users of the River. This growth quickly filled the old Gallagher's Lumber Yard (Swedish Embassy) with shells. That space has been eliminated in the face of huge growth, participation and interest. Congestion at the Thompsons nexus has created much wasted time and unneeded aggravation to our local River users. All of these thousands of River users are totally water dependent. The study did not fully take into account a high priority for water dependent users while non-water waterfront users have gone from planning to completion during the thirty plus years of NPS studies for water dependent users. River users have experienced growth and loss of space during the past thirty years. It is time for the NPS to take action.

The Study does not address the concept that the Boathouse Zone actually needs to be larger for the needs of the current users, not to mention the future users. The student groups that will largely use these boathouses and they use bicycles and walking as a mode of transportation and create no parking issues.

It is well past the time for the NPS to stop being part of delaying the creation of more boathouses and take positive supportive actions. There is extensive public demand represented by real people attempting to use the river in an uncomfortable and congested environment.

Sincerely,

Frank Benson

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 88

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Townsend Walker
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2515 Larkin
San Francisco, CA 94109
USA
E-mail: townsend@aperimus.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Some background: My parents met and married in Washington, I was born in Washington, I lived there while attending Georgetown and after graduation. While I lived in the city I rowed for Georgetown, canoed to the Watergate concerts and hiked along the canal.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating a Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to specify sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

There have been eight over the last thirty years. I don't think more are necessary.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Townsend Walker

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 89

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Marc Rosenkoetter
Organization: Georgetown University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Atlanta, GA 30309
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New
Date Sent: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1
Contains Request(s): No
Notes:
Park Correspondence Log:
Date Received: 05/21/2013
Form Letter: No
Type: Web Form

Correspondence Text

Hello,

I wanted to write and share my opinion regarding the Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study.

I rowed in the Varsity program at Georgetown University in the fall of 1998. One morning on the way to practice, I was injured in a bicycle accident very close to Thompson Boat Center. The injury was career ending and I ended up in the hospital for 7 nights. During my stay in the hospital, I'll never forget the visit from a foot surgeon where amputation was discussed. Thankfully the doctors were able to spare my foot, and I spent the next 9 months in intensive physical therapy.

The fact is if Georgetown University had it's own boathouse closer to the university, I would have traveled a shorter distance biking to practice in the mornings. Less distance traveled on a bicycle that morning would have unequivocally lowered the risk of injury en route to practice.

As a general safety concern, when looking at this study, I can't help but think about the other student athletes who may have been injured en route to Thompson Boat Center in the past 30 years of studies, and the others who may be injured in the future from delays as a result of unwarranted, additional studies.

Consequently, I wanted to voice my opinion that I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. For the safety of Georgetown student athletes, more study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Sincerely,
Marc Rosenkoetter
(Georgetown class of 2001)

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 90

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Hershey, PA 17033
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As an past Georgetown rower, jogger, outdoor lover, and community member, I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted. Their presence in these areas would only add to the beauty and character of the Potomac shoreline without disrupting the frontage.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 91

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: John Gregory
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4114 Davis PI NW
#212
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail: gregoryj@mindspring.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support development of boathouses for the Key Bridge area. I rowed for for Georgetown in the 1960's, returned to Washington after college, and have lived here for 39 years. I live in the neighborhood and am an almost daily user of the canal and the towpath. It is important not to dealy construction any longer.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 92

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

Washington, DC 20001
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I want to express how important it is that we move forward quickly and with no further delay to designate sites for boathouses for Georgetown University and George Washington University. Having lived and worked in the Georgetown area for over ten years, and as a user of the canal path on a regular basis, I am in full support of moving forward with the project.

As many have mentioned, both Boston and Philadelphia have multiple boathouses in use on less water space and have been able to strike a balance between the community and those interested in boating activities, and we should be able to do the same. The overflow of rowers out of Thompson's Boathouse was exacerbated by the construction of the Swedish Embassy several years ago, and this strain continues to grow.

In regards to the size of the boathouse, it is important that any boathouse built needs to be built with generations to come in mind. The aforementioned boathouses that occupy the banks of the Charles and Schuylkill rivers have stood for nearly a century, and this project too should be able to stand the test of time, accommodating crews for years to come. After 30 years of discussion and debate around the construction of a new boathouse on the Potomac, I see no further reason for delay.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 93

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Greg Charte
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 15 Highland Avenue
 Red Bank, NJ 07701
 USA
E-mail: jcharte@comcast.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

"I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted."

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 94

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Dee Bragg
Organization: Georgetown University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 9 Peabody Lane
 Darien, CT 06820
 USA
E-mail: deebragg@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

My daughter was a recruited rower for Georgetown for all 4 years of her time at school from September, 2009 until May 2013. She was named Captain her senior year. We, as parents, would greatly appreciate a boathouse close to the Georgetown campus. Currently, she has to leave campus and travel through deserted streets very early in the morning and late in the evening. I believe she should be able to row in a facility that is part of Georgetown instead of having to share with multiple people and schools. They have the funding and have been trying to get this accomplished for 30 years. It would enable Georgetown to recruit better rowers if they had their own boathouse. Every school they compete with in the country has their own boathouse (with the exception of George Washington U). No other rowers have to share their boathouses with other clubs and schools.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the

Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Please give these rowers their own boathouse.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 95

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Andrew Brown
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Boston, MA 02109
USA
E-mail: andrewcbrown1@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a former student of Georgetown, former resident of Washington D.C. and now a frequent visitor to the District for work, I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.

Boathouse sites for these universities would provide the beginning of a beautiful waterfront similar to Philadelphia's famed Boathouse Row, where rowers launch their boats alongside runners and cyclists utilizing the adjacent trail.

The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Both universities and the constituents that currently utilize the Capital Crescent Trail should be able to find a solution that will allow for the universities to alleviate the current overcrowding at Thompson's Boathouse, and do so without restricting access to commuters, cyclists, joggers, and hikers that enjoy the trail today.

Please feel free to reach out to me for further comments or questions.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 96**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a Georgetown resident for over 5 years, I support and approve the complete list of sites (A, C, D, E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I am also in favor of designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and expediting the designation of sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. Both universities have more than adequate Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. It would seem that additional study, following some eight prior studies and three decades would be clearly unneeded and spurious.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 97**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert W. Moran
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DC 20001
USA
E-mail: robertwmoran@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To Whome It May Concern --

I am a graduate of Georgetown, a former rower, and have been a resident of Washington, DC since 1997. I am also a runner, a biker, and hiker. I actively enjoyed all facets of the Georgetown Waterfront / Potomac shoreline as a student, and I still do as a resident of this city.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Best regards,
Robert Moran

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 98

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Denis Chagnon, MD
Organization: Georgetown University Graduate
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
 Lake Placid, NY 12946
 USA
E-mail: dchagnon@nycap.rr.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a graduate of Georgetown, and was deeply involved in Rowing in the late 1960's and early 1970's. I am strongly in favor of having Georgetown build it's own boathouse, and have followed closely the efforts and developments of the past 25 years or more in hoping to establish it's own boathouse along the Potomac. This comment is in favor of proceeding with the carefully thought out plans for a Georgetown Boathouse. I am excited that this may come to fruition in the next several years. I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 99

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Jude Sotherlund
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Merritt Island, FL 32952
USA
E-mail: sotherlund@msn.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I offer a unique perspective on rowing on the Potomac River. I am from a rowing family -- 6 of my siblings and I rowed for Washington-Lee High School, Potomac Boat Club (PBC) and/or Georgetown University. I rowed for all three. I have also coached Women's Rowing at several locations(on the Potomac, the Charles River - Boston, and the Orange River - FL) cited in focus groups as comparators for boat traffic and etiquette. As a management consultant I have seen the values and strategies team sports instill implemented in the workplace. There are very few athletic sports that require the dedication, dependency, teamwork, and interrelationships rowing demands.

I strongly support the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone at any of the proposed sites - A, C, D and E. Knowing first-hand

that portion of the Potomac, I believe it to be some of the safest, most accessible shoreline along the Potomac. Even if one is experiencing rough water, when winds kick-up unexpectedly while out on a row, that stretch of shoreline is easy to access and permits some of the safest docking. Issues of etiquette exist on every waterfront, and right of ways could easily be discussed/shared/implemented along that stretch for all boat traffic. Traffic patterns and river etiquette are part of the annual update at other University's with rowing programs.

There has been a sustained, high demand for additional rowing facilities for decades. I can personally recall PBC having no space for additional shells as far back as 1975! The issues have been studied, and focus groups have been held. I am writing to encourage a "can do" attitude toward the development of the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and the swift designation of sites for both Georgetown University and George Washington University.

When I began rowing in 9th grade at Washington-Lee High School it changed my life. Writing to ensure other student-athletes have the same opportunity is the least I can do.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 100**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Timothy A. Garry, Jr.
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2242 Cameron Avenue
Cincinnati, Ohio 45212
Cincinnati, OH 45212
USA
E-mail: tgarry@davidsonlaw.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
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 this Feasibility Study for the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone on the Georgetown waterfront. I coxed and sculled for Georgetown University from 1978-1982, and coxed for the Potomac Boat Club, starting as an absolute novice. I continued to compete in rowing for a total of 14 years, including as a graduate and masters rowing competitor, for the Cincinnati Rowing Center and the Milwaukee Rowing Club. I have two sons who rowed in high school in Cincinnati, one of whom rowed for his university in Philadelphia. I am currently engaged in the formation of an adaptive rowing program on the Great Miami River in Hamilton, Ohio, to allow people with spina bifida and other physical challenges to row in safety.

Both sons were Boy Scouts in Cincinnati Troop 6, one of them an Eagle Scout, so in addition to rowing, we have

hiked, kayaked, and paddled many great waterways throughout North America.

Based on my 35 years of rowing, hiking, kayaking, and other paddling, I can report a couple of things. First, much learning can be had on and around the water. That learning can include good sportsmanship, devotion to others, safe boating, and the development of deep environmental concern for waterways, wetlands, and shorelands. While an undergraduate at Georgetown, I had a relationship with the Potomac River and developed an appreciation for its importance to the District of Columbia, which I simply could not have enjoyed without rowing on it.

Second, the popularity of rowing, kayaking, and paddling continues to grow, especially rowing. While in the late 1970s there were scores of high school, junior, college and masters, and adaptive rowing programs, there are now hundreds and hundreds of them across our great country. This growth includes more undergraduate students at George Washington University and Georgetown University than ever engaged in their rowing programs. As a result, the Thompson Boat Center, where I learned to cox and scull, is oversubscribed. Our public leadership should work to provide practical and easy access to the Potomac River rowers, canoeists, and kayakers, so they can participate in these great sports to educate and develop themselves in this way.

Aside from the fact that many Olympic athletes have trained and raced on the Potomac River, many others have developed themselves as people on the Potomac, too. A couple of days after the earthquake in Haiti in January, 2010, I was contacted by friends in Cincinnati who had been in the process of adopting two orphans from a creche in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. One of my first calls was to one of my Georgetown boatmates, who had spent his career with the State Department to seek his guidance as to how to get these two kids, and 103 others from this creche from rubble and unsanitary conditions in PAP to their adoptive parents in the USA. My work led to me to a woman who worked for the Department of Homeland Security, who worked tirelessly to see that the children who were eligible for the DHS's humanitarian parole to the US, received it. I later learned that this DHS employee had rowed in Cambridge, MA for Radcliffe College.

Leaders in Greater Boston and Philadelphia have managed to accommodate the increase in popularity of rowing in their communities by approving and facilitating the construction of new boathouses over the last couple of decades, including the Boston University Boathouse, and Community Rowing, Inc. on the Charles and the Saint Joseph's University and Saint Joe's Prep Gillen Boathouse right along the Schuylkill River racecourse in Fairmount Park in Philadelphia. The leadership in Washington, D.C., including the National Park Service, should continue to have the vision to do the same.

I like all the sites (A,C, D, and E) shown in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as practicable to designate boathouse sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University, including exchanging their Potomac shoreline property for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after some 8 prior studies spanning some 30 years, seems unwarranted.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Respectfully,

Tim Garry, Jr.
Georgetown College, '82 (American Studies)
Cincinnati, Ohio

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 101

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Penny Pagano
Organization: Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3D
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: PO Box 40846 Palisades Station
Washington DC 20016
Washington , DC 20016
USA
E-mail: anc3d@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

May 21, 2013

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

RE: ANC3D support of the Low Density Scenario by NPS presented in the feasibility study to implement a non-motorized boathouse zone along the Georgetown waterfront

Dear Mr. May:

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3D reaffirms its support for protecting the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park from private development-this time in reference to the non-motorized boathouse feasibility study that the National Park Service commenced. The boundaries of our ANC include the Capital Crescent Trail; the C&O Canal; the tow path; and the Potomac River almost up to Key Bridge. We have for years actively opposed any activity which would compromise the integrity or ecology of this treasured national Park.

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

At its properly-noticed public meeting on May 1, 2013, held at the American University, School of International Service, Room 333, Washington, DC 20016, with a quorum present at all times, Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 3D voted 6-0-1 to support the position of the Defenders of the Potomac River Parkland ("Defenders") and to

support the "Low Density Scenario" that does not involve intrusive development harmful to the C&O Canal National Historical Park. Three of our Commissioners Districts include the affected areas, as described above, and we have great confidence and respect for the hard work and analysis of the Defenders.

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

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

We support and appreciate the conservation mission of the National Park Service, which we believe will be enhanced with the Low Density option.

Sincerely,

Penny Pagano
Chair, ANC3D

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 102

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Charles Donly
Organization: Georgetown University Rowing Alumni
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2100 drew ave s
minneapolis, MN 55416
USA
E-mail: contact@donly.me

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline

date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Additionally, I would add that I lived in Washington DC 1/2 my life. I used many of the trails for running, biking and even the northern Potomac area for rock climbing frequently. We should support all reasonable positive athletic uses of our outdoor space.

Currently, I live in Suzhou, China, and the boathouse here is nicer than anything I had while I was at Georgetown. The DC area deserves landmark buildings like those in Philly and Boston that help to accentuate the positive character of the city.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 103**

Author Information

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

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am an avid user of the C&O Canal NHP. I take a great personal interest in the park and support it as a volunteer on multiple programs in the park. I visit all sections of the park on a regular basis and appreciate it as a priceless cultural and natural resource.

I am not in favor of private development within the park. The park is a resource for all to use, and dedicated private use of any part of it is not consistent with that goal. Exclusive dedication of a section of the park not appropriate; any resources or concessions should be the use of all park visitors.

Team rowing facilities should be outside of the C & O Canal NHP. Use of special rowing equipment or multi-person shells would be disruptive to other park visitors in an already congested area.

I am in favor of the Low Density scenario in the study. This is the only scenario that offers a fair compromise and

preserves the cultural and natural resources of the park.

Thank you for the chance to offer my opinion.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 104**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Ron DeGrandis
Organization: Georgetown University rowing Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Rocky River, OH 44116
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted. I graduated 45 years ago and I would like to see something happen before I die.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 105**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mark P. Stern
Organization: Georgetown Rowing
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 823 Spruce Street
Deerfield, IL 60015
USA

E-mail: markstern@comcast.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

A nonmotorized boathouse would be a welcome addition to the Georgetown Waterfront. The study makes it clear that Thompson Boat Center does not meet the needs of the many rowers who wish to row on the Potomac. A new boathouse would both enhance the waterfront and provide the necessary facilities for the community's many rowers.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 106**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Erica N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Arlington, VA 22201
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and a site for Georgetown University. I am a Georgetown alum and a former member of the Georgetown Women's Crew team. It was a formative experience for me and taught me both leadership and teamwork skills. It also was the beginning of lifelong friendships and an appreciation for the Georgetown waterfront. When I arrived at Georgetown, our team heard that Georgetown was planning a boathouse and we were so excited. The current facility was crowded and unclean. The bathroom stalls didn't lock and there was no ventilation during winter workouts so the dirty mirrors would fog up as we sweat. We were students, we were athletes and we were members of the Georgetown community. But we were training in a facility that was inadequate and certainly more crowded than neighboring waterfront boathouses.

The rowers who will row out of this boathouse will care about the waterfront as much as any of the dissenters commenting here. They will know the view from under Key Bridge and they will become stronger teammates and members of the Georgetown community. After graduating many of them, like me and several of my teammates will work and live in DC, Maryland or Virginia and will still care about the Georgetown Waterfront. Like me, they will visit the restaurants when the weather gets nice, and cheer for their Hoyas when they race. And like me, they will rent kayaks from one of the other boathouses and bike along the canal. Allowing Georgetown to build a boathouse means more people will care about the waterfront, not fewer.

After decades of delay, a boathouse facility is overdue. Georgetown rowing isn't a faceless entity. It has my face. It has my teammates' faces. It has the faces of this year's rowers and next year's and the year after that. And we care. We care about the waterfront and we care about Georgetown rowing. They are not mutually exclusive. What is good for Georgetown rowing can also be good for the waterfront, if you let it.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 107**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Brian H. Kane
Organization: Georgetown Rowing Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Stamford, CT 06907
USA
E-mail: gtown_rower@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 108**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Adam G. Clemens
Organization: Georgetown Alumnus
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Westport, CT 06880
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

As a former rower from Georgetown (class of 1984), I can attest to the value and education of my rowing experience. The "coming of age" experience and camaraderie I gained by rowing daily on the Potomac river as a Georgetown student are my most favorite memories. The rowers are using the river in the right way and learn the importance of hard work, team work and perseverance in the face of exhaustion and all that the river and the elements can throw at you. Please find a way to preserve the invaluable tradition of student competitive rowing by insuring there is a long term, permanent solution and home for our boathouse on the Potomac.

This problem is solvable. Lets all work together to get it done in the spirit of cooperation and mutual respect for each other.

Respectfully,

Adam G Clemens
BSFS Foreign Service
Georgetown Class of 1984

Hoya Saxa!

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 109

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Rocque Kramer
Organization: Megaburst, Inc.
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1800 Edgehill Drive
Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail: geizerx@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

In Spring of 2012 a Master Thesis was presented at Virginia Tech School of Architecture for the repurposing of a Potomac River aquaduct which aimed at providing new access points to the river as well as accommodating bikers, hikers and environmentalists. It avoids capturing land on the DC and Virginia banks for private and restricted use. It was awarded a school prize for design and integration of multiple uses into a single structure. It appears to be a possible solution for the many competing interests who have given voice to the current concepts and may broaden the discussion to consider a new infrastructure. It might at least bring a new concept to the debate. The designer, Erik Kramer, is now employed as an architect with the San Francisco firm EightInc. They have provided much of the design work for Apple and other Pacific Rim companies. (see kramer@eightinc.com for access to url renderings)

The general concept would be to rebuild the 1840's bridge pilings that originally connected the C&O canal with the Virginia shore and form a low level structure that would connect the two shores up river from Key Bridge but between the Potomac boat house and the canoe club. At each of the abutments which are now 12' underwater a variety of structures would be built to house racing shells, other non-motorized craft, coffee house, viewing platforms, etc.

We know that many of the early renaissance towns used bridges in similar ways. This concept opens up access to a larger cohort while still providing much needed utility to the universities that bring intellectual energy and life to our town.

The concept appears to bring three primary benefits:

1. It provides "new found land" to build on. Uncontested at this point, at least.
2. It broadens the user base.
3. It might even provide new tax revenue to the City.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 110

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: john r. curran
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
sudbury, MA 01776
USA
E-mail: john.curran@comcast.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I rowed at Georgetown in 1967.

That experience and my return to the Potomac to row as well as canoe since that time has been an important part of my life.

I reviewed the NPS study and I support the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone as designated by the Feasibility Study.

This will enhance the opportunities for many future rowers including students at Georgetown and GW to make this wonderful river a part of their lives.

Please move as quickly as possible to make this happen.

Sincerely,

John Curran MD

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 111

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mary Barnicle
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:

Chicago, IL 60611
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after eight prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted. Since I personally benefitted from rowing at Georgetown University I hope that the NPS can move quickly from this point to safeguard this important and historic use of the shoreline.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 112

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Joseph Sallette
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
 Arlington, VA 22201
 USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a Georgetown University graduate, former member of the crew team, and resident of Virginia I fully support the building of a new boathouse and public recreational use facility near the Key Bridge.

Despite the studies identifying only invasive species of plants, soil that is not habitable for reptiles or amphibians and that the area is not inviting for birds or many wildlife- I understand why other residents may want to preserve this wooded area defined as site A.

I also see historical value in preserving site B. There is no overstating the complexity and risks in doing anything more than preserving the Washington Canoe Club in place.

The other sites of C, D and E are the best compromises to solve the very real problem of overcrowding at Thompson's Boat Center and lack of access for the public to launch craft into the Potomac.

This process has drawn on far too long, and enough studies have been done. It is time to compromise and agree on the solution of building at least one new boathouse for the universities who will use the facility daily and year-round, as well as create an occasionally-used public access point on sites C, D and/or E.

Sincerely,
Joe Sallette

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 113

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Leonard Hill
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Herron Island, WA 98349
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I strongly support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and moving forward to identify sites for university boathouses. I rowed at Georgetown University 30+ years ago and still marvel at the strength and grace of crews on the water each time I return to Washington, DC. The NPS has before it an opportunity to help create along the shore of the Potomac something to rival the beauty and dignity of Boathouse Row in Philadelphia. The time to act on this

opportunity is now.

There is plenty of room for everyone and for multiple uses of the river and the shore. That has been crystal clear for at least as long as I have rowed on the Potomac. The issue of university boathouses has been studied and studied and studied over decades; the choices have been examined exhaustively, and further study will not tell us anything new.

I urge the NPS to move forward on shoreline property exchanges with Georgetown and George Washington and help to begin an exciting new era on the water.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 114**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Pierre Maitre
Organization: Georgetown University Alumni
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 850 Third Avenue
20th Floor
New York, NY 10022
USA
E-mail: pierrejmaitre@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

All sites indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses make sense. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.

The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 115**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Michael L. Vespoli
Organization: Georgetown Rowing Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
New Haven, CT 06513
USA
E-mail: mvespoli@vespoli.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I fully support the concept of a Non-motorized Boathouse Zone and think that all the sites suggested (A, B, C & D) are viable options. Georgetown has been attempting for over 25+ years to replace their boathouse which once stood on the banks of the Potomac back in the 19th century. The University has land to swap based on an understanding with the NPS which goes back at least 25+ years. In that time rowing has continued to flourish and the Thompson Boat Center is overflowing with teams and individuals. This is limiting access to the river because of the overcrowding at Thompson's and hurting the performance of the GU crew. The only way to alleviate the over crowding and allow the programs to reach their competitive goals is to allow each university to build it's own facility in the non-motorized zone. These buildings would greatly enhance the waterfront (think Boathouse Row in Philadelphia) and allow more access to a healthy and green activity for all DC citizens. The time for studies is long past (GU has spent enough money on EIS studies mandated by NPS already). The 25+ year continued persistence of the DC area rowing community generally and Georgetown U specifically should tell you that we really need this facility and will continue to work to achieve this. Every obstacle has been thrown in our way but none of them have been legitimate reasons for not allowing GU, and now GWU, to build boathouses. PLEASE let this happen NOW. It will be good for all.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 116

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Peter Moley
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Darien, CT 06820
USA
E-mail: peter-moley@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I was happy to see and greatly appreciate the National Park Services's most recent Feasibility Study for the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone on the Georgetown Waterfront. I have followed this issue for many years and read the current postings from both sides on this website. Clearly there is a lot of controversy about the proposed building of two University Boathouses along the Potomac. I am in favor of the construction of the boathouses.

For full disclosure, I am both a rower and a cyclist. I have enjoyed countless hours on the Potomac both rowing on the water and cycling on the tow path. My belief is that both activities can co-exist without conflict as long as there is proper planning. The supporters of rowing and of the C & O canal probably have much more in common than they have differences. Like many issues today in Washington, the shared common goals are washed out by extremist on both sides.

I truly hope that this issue can be resolved. Two well built and maintained boathouses will most likely enhance the waterfront and will definitely allow for improved non-motorized use of the river. I would like to thank the National Park Service again for their persistence is trying to solve this difficult but important issue.

Pete Moley

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 117

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Chris A. Sindoni
Organization: Georgetown Rowing Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
 Conshohocken, PA 19428
 USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Georgetown rowing was a wonderful experience for myself and my fellow classmates. I was part of the men's heavyweight team. Being a member of the team was like a second family. I met my wife, a Hoya women's lightweight, at Georgetown. It is a major part of our lives. The one thing missing from our experience at Georgetown was a place we could call our own. Sharing Thompson's boathouse with several other high schools and another college was very difficult at times. Georgetown rowing is consistently in the top 20 nationally year in and year out. The program deserves a boathouse that matches the success on the water. I have been to various rivers and lakes lined with beautiful boathouses, similar to the one Georgetown is proposing to build. Boathouse row in Philadelphia, Princeton's boathouse in New Jersey and all of the boathouses along the Charles in Boston do nothing but enhance the areas they are in.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Thanks.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 118

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: William F. Quirk, Jr
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Brighton, MA 02135
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a Georgetown University graduate from the class of 2008 and a proud Hoya rower. I make no effort to disguise my allegiance or feign objectivity in this comment section. I write to give voice to what I feel has been an underrepresented and often misrepresented constituency. While some have aimed to frame the Georgetown Boathouse proposals as intrusions and a damaging blight on the surrounding environment of the Potomac waterfront,

I find this characterization disappointing and shortsighted. The Potomac River was home to me and my crew mates for four wonderful years. My best collegiate memories were made on that river, and the hours and years logged in those shells have coalesced into a strong commitment to the preservation and upkeep of the river's natural beauty. The community of Georgetown rowers wants nothing but the best for the riverfront area. As boaters go, rowers are often closest to the shoreline and to the water itself. Regularly doused by spray and occasionally submerged entirely, our teams want a clean, well-preserved environment. I have vivid memories of my freshman year, when our coach would regularly stop practice up beyond Three Sisters and ask us to take in the surroundings: the gentle waterfall on the Rosslyn shore, the bald eagle perched atop the nearby tree. The appreciation our teams have for the natural landscape of our sport runs deep - as deep or deeper than any other constituency attempting to frame us as a nameless, faceless organizational strong-arm.

Georgetown rowers are some of the hardest working, most dedicated students on Georgetown's campus. They understand the opportunity they have to challenge themselves and compete nationally, and they take tremendous pride in the hard work and dedication they put forth. This is why consistently it is the Georgetown rowing team that tops the list of team contributions to Georgetown Athletics. The men and women who go through the program understand the need for proper facilities, the duty they have to support future generations of Georgetown rowing, and the commitment to excellence we all share. The sport and the people who comprise it up celebrate active, outdoor lifestyles. We are fit, friendly, and welcoming to outsiders. I see no reason for tension to exist between the canoeing community and ours, nor is the preservation of the canal bike trail any less important to us. These are important fixtures to the Potomac life that we value highly. A boathouse does not damage these areas nor encroach on others' turf, but it does provide a necessary venue for our team's growth. The current arrangements at Thompson's Boat Center are simply not sustainable. Housing so many different crews, both college and high school, as TBC does, hinders each team and causes frustration at all levels. Without adequate space, crews are forced to practice on top of one another, and the increased traffic flow in and out of one dock space creates a bottleneck. Allowing an additional boathouse will ease this undue burden on TBC while simultaneously allowing national-caliber crews to enjoy the necessary and long-needed facilities. Not only should the local residents and larger Georgetown community celebrate these driven student-athletes and allow them a sufficient place for training, it is my strong belief that the construction of a school boathouse will encourage further outreach to the community, increase the participation in low-profile river activities (nonmotorized boating), and provide a general community gathering point.

The Potomac riverfront stands to benefit aesthetically, as much as by such community enhancements. Opening the doors of this new boathouse to spring weekend learn-to-rows, trash pick-up initiatives, and other open community luncheons are enticing benefits this potential structure allows. I am encouraged by this ongoing discussion and want to endorse building sites A,C,D, and E. I hope we can arrive at a swift resolution and move forward with decisive positive action. We have for too long stalled this action. Let us now build and grow and enhance this beautiful riverfront we all call home.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 119

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: T Norton
Organization: Old Rower / GU alumni (1986)
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Singapore, UN 098327
SGP

E-mail: ndm20@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

It is hard to believe that this matter, that of the development of non-motorized boating boathouses, specifically included in the Georgetown Waterfront Park Master Plan already in 1987, has been outstanding for some 26 years. I first arrived in Georgetown as a student, and rower, in 1982. Rowing represented for me and my fellow rowers, both male and female, utter unabridged joy. There is a saying by a Yale Rower from the 1950s: "There is more to life than rowing; but not much." Rowing in the Potomac was deliverance from any and all afflictions and presented one with a feeling of natural harmony even if physically hard earned; this harmony instilled in each rower a feeling of reverence for nature as each rower inevitably experienced so many early morning dawns, all different, and brilliant, exuberant evenings. To experience even one of these early morning or evening sessions is to experience nature's full unabridged glory. This applies to all rowers on the river. This reverence and respect for nature comes with the sport. So it remains, I am sure. Over the years rowing has grown and become more accessible (and more inclusive - a good thing) to young and veteran practitioners alike; all attracted to the sport, memories, camaraderie and surely the pristine location. I believe all rowers, past, present and future, are fully cognizant of the privilege that it is to row in the Potomac and of the natural sanctity of the place. Therefore, I think we can all understand those who seek to ensure that such natural sanctity remains for our own offspring and those of others. It is a noble calling and it seeks, like us rowers, to preserve for posterity what that place is like - but that place is also, and has been for so many years (centuries, believe or not), and without an iota of doubt, a place for rowing. To prevent the development of new updated boathouses, in any of the locations so designated in the study so suggested by the NPS after so many studies and consultations (which are all essentially acceptable), is to negate the Potomac its full utility and usage, rightfully earned by so many men and women over so many years. Further, the proposed few world-class boathouses will not detract but in fact enhance the place, aesthetically and functionally. There will be more orderly enjoyment. So, in conclusion, I urge all who oppose the development of much needed boathouses to acknowledge that rowers are, like you, "custodians of a place" that we all wish to preserve for all to enjoy, now and in the next century to come. I also urge all involved to accelerate the process of a final decision as delay represents a profound injustice, surely a waste of time and resources, and a disservice to rowers, all proud custodians of the Potomac.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 120

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kim Keller
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
New York, NY 10011
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013	Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form
Notes:	

Correspondence Text

I am in full support of designating a Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone, allocating the spaces for rowing boathouses, and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Adding additional space for rowing boathouses will solve a severe overcrowding of the existing Thompson Boathouse, which serves both university, high school, and community needs. Georgetown has shown a clear desire to work within the NPS framework to address community concerns, and is committed to constructing a boathouse that will both address a university and community need.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 121

Author Information

Keep Private:	No
Name:	John Carlson
Organization:	
Organization Type:	I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:	28 Atlantic Ave Washington, DC 20007 USA
E-mail:	jack.l.carlson@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013	Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form
Notes:	

Correspondence Text

I've spent many enjoyable mornings rowing out on the Potomac, and it has brought me into contact with the city and with nature in ways I never would have explored otherwise. Study after study has been undertaken on this boathouse zone, and now it is time to stop delaying and to approve a site. More people need to have the opportunity to enjoy the river, and not from the cramped and inadequate facilities of Thompsons Boat Center.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 122

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Zack Kurland
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 40 Pacella Drive
Boston, MA 02026
USA
E-mail: zrk@georgetown.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. Also, of particular note, Georgetown University can trace it's roots on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the late 1700s. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted and a waste of money, resources and time.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 123

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mirco J. Haag
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Salinas, CA 93908
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 124

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted and completely unnecessary.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 125

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Cory Bosworth
Organization: Harvard University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 65 N. Harvard St.
Boston, MA, MA 02163
USA
E-mail: crboswor@fas.harvard.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 126

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Patrick McGinnis

Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 756 Washington Street, Apt. 4C
New York
New York, NY 10014
USA
E-mail: pjmcginnis@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I think that all of the sites mentioned in the study(A, C, D & E) for boat houses. I would be supportive of moving to choose sites from GWU and Georgetown U. It's time to take action on this important project rather than continue to assess what is clearly a good idea.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 127

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: CARTER COLLISON
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 701 S. Olive Ave
Unit #612
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
USA
E-mail: CARTER.COLLISON@GMAIL.COM

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Enough is enough. Georgetown University is a staple of the community and has been dragged through enough red tape. Eight studies!!! Wow! Look at boathouse row in Philadelphia. It is gorgeous and highlights the river and surrounding nature nicely. I read through the study and do not see any reason to not approve this project. Unfortunately, it appears the project has been delayed for such a long time due to affluent neighbors flexing their political and monetary muscles. Georgetown University deals with its neighbors with respect and consideration. I do not like the we were here first argument. People should be nice to one another no matter the circumstance and respect people's rights of a peaceful quiet environment. However, Georgetown needs a new boathouse and the proposal seems very appropriate to me. I am always open to hearing other perspectives but the Georgetown argument, as of now, seems like a very strong case. Good luck with the process and I hope the Canoe club will see this as a positive mutual benefit rather than someone encroaching on their private secluded space.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 128**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Joseph M. Ledvina
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Arlington, VA 22209
USA
E-mail: Ledvina.joseph@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Hello,

I am writing in regards to the NMBZ survey conducted and recently released by the NPS. As a Georgetown rowing alumnus, current Potomac Boat Club member, and current high school coach out of Thompsons Boat Center, I write today with a strong interest in continued development of facilities on the Potomac River in Georgetown. I fully support structures being built on all available sites (A, C, D, and E). Having read the entire report, I do not fully agree with the assumption that site A only supports a small boat facility. It would be a great service to the rowing community for both Georgetown and George Washington Universities to be able to build their planned boathouses. It will clear space and alleviate crowding at TBC for the high schools there. I appreciate your consideration.

Regards,
Joe Ledvina

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 129

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Matthew J. Stoller
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:



E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am an alumnus of Georgetown University (COL '08). I support all the sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.

I know the historical importance of the crew team and its effect on Georgetown. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

I have also lived in Cambridge, Massachusetts. I have seen the beneficial, synergistic effect having a boathouse on the river has added to the environment. It is neither a blight nor a hindrance; on the contrary, it is a historic addition to the river grounds.

More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

[Please keep my personally-identifiable information private]

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 130

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Ashley L. Howard
Organization: Georgetown University Alumni

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 5507 6th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98107
USA
E-mail: alh63gu@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support sites A, C, D and E indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses and the designation of the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. I support proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. As a former student and rower at Georgetown University, I can attest that the Georgetown community has had a positive presence on the Potomac River shoreline dating back well into the 19th century. Both Georgetown and GW universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years should be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 131

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Thomas F. Bullock
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Wilmington, DE 19807
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I urge the development of a responsible rowing center or centers in the NM zones identified in the report. The need for these facilities is well documented. The level of bona fide responsible stewardship that the collegiate and private rowing groups bring to the Potomac shoreline is also evident. As a rower from 1965-68, I recall the industrial uses that served the needs of that era. We now find a different set of needs, and the ability to construct appropriate rowing facilities should be given all required permits, now.

Issue the permits, please. VTY, Thomas F. Bullock

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 132

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Marc S. Mandel
Organization: Gonzaga College High School Crew
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 19 Eye St, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Washington, DC 20001
USA
E-mail: mmandel@gonzaga.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Gonzaga College High School Crew strongly supports the addition of boathouses along the Potomac. Other cities (Boston, Philadelphia) have embraced the addition of boathouses along their historic rivers, and in these locations, boathouses add to the richness of the area.

Given the decades spent on this topic, it is astonishing that not one single boathouse has been constructed. It is time to start acting.

We strongly support the highest density alternative.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 133

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Thomas Guthrie
Organization: Georgetown University Rowing Team

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: LXR 234 Box 578717
Georgetown University 37th and O
Washington, DC 20057
USA
E-mail: thomas.a.guthrie@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 134

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Ben Domenico
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2489 Briarwood Drive
Boulder, CO 80305
USA
E-mail: bendomenico@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As I interpret the document, the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone is an ideal location for a college rowing boathouse with Georgetown University in the background. The picturesque area is already being greatly enhanced by the park development on the other side of Key Bridge. It's a favorite area for my family to visit on trips to DC. A college crew boathouse would add even more to the ambiance of the area.

All sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses meet with my approval. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. After 8 prior studies over 30 years, more study is clearly unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 135**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Theodor j. Kundtz
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 108 Forest Drive Short Hills NJ
Short Hills , NJ 07078
USA
E-mail: tjkundtz@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To Whom It May Concern

Whenever thinking about projects like this I think it is helpful to view it as a cost/benefit analysis. In this case it appears to me the benefits greatly outweigh the cost opponents. Developing a boathouse row facility not only greatly enhances the interest level in the area but benefits the thousands of rowers and their supporters and bystanders who will be making use of the enhanced facilities. So much of the great historical art depicts city rivers scenes full of life with active river activities. Rowing, canoeing, and paddle boats offer a terrific non-polluting, and quiet way to enjoy one of our nations most beautiful rivers. This is a unique opportunity to open up the river to many more people as opposed to "protecting" it for the privileged few. The Washington boat club has their space and do not want anyone else to share it. I think that after 8 environmental studies over the past 25 years, we can make a decision on this. The "cost" of the project will be to upset those privileged few who object to any and all expansion and the benefit is to the many thousands of people who will have a greatly enhanced experience and be able to more fully enjoy the Potomac.

Thank you for your consideration of my letter of support to move this project forward. Sincerely, Theodor Kundtz

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 136

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Princeton, NJ 08540
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 137

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DC 20007
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 139

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: J H
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
New York, NY 10036
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Sites A, C, D and E in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses should be allowed. I support the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and feel that sites for the Georgetown University and George Washington University boathouses should be quickly designated.

Georgetown has been rowing on the Potomac dating back to the 19th century. The universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

Both universities have always shown great respect for the river and its shores; they will certainly serve as great marshalls, captains and protectors of the Potomac. The feasibility study provides clarification that the proposed sites would serve well for the non-motorized boat houses, and there will be no better tenants than Georgetown and GW.

Further studies after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 140

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mary Snieckus
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
1700 Dublin Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20902
USA

E-mail: msnieckus@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I applaud the NPS for completing this study as it will be helpful to have more guidance and structure for land use and recreational opportunities in this popular areas.

I respectfully request that the area east of 34th street also be considered for structures. If that isn't possible I urge your adoption of the low impact scenario. The reasons for my recommendations:

1. The part of the C&O Canal NHP included in the feasibility study is rich in historical assets, including the towpath and the ruins of the Alexandria Aqueduct, and these features need to be the focus of the area.
2. This portion of the canal park is environmentally vulnerable and includes scenic wooded shoreline that must be preserved to reduce shoreline erosion. Accessible well designed boating facilities will help in this regard.
3. This part of the canal park is extremely popular but very narrow, presenting a danger of crowding along the canal towpath and Capital Crescent Trail, so moving new structure away from this area is the preferred alternative to avoid accidents and conflict.
4. Areas downriver from the canal park are entirely suitable for new boating-related structures and afford better vehicular access.

The C&O Canal National Historical Park belongs to everyone, not private interests - so I do not support new private facilities within the study area.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 141

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Jonathan Askonas
Organization: Georgetown University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3723 Reservoir Rd
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail: jda43@georgetown.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 142

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
 Arlington, VA 22209
 USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 143

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Andrew Campbell
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 73 Lowell Mail Ctr
Cambridge, MA 02138-7527
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 144

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Patrick O'Leary
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Cambridge, MA 02138
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I fully support programming the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone in a manner that promptly allows the designation of sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. After numerous previous studies stretching over several decades, there is simply no need for further study at this point. Georgetown's multi-century rowing tradition on the Potomac and George Washington's likewise admirable rowing program are limited today by the lack of adequate facilities on the river. The feasibility study makes clear that development of new boathouses can be accomplished without any serious adverse impacts and the universities are both willing and able to develop the sites and provide valuable shoreline property in exchange for designated sites ? there is simply no justifiable reason to continue to delay this process.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 145

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Nicholas M. Berry
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 321 East 75th Street #2FE
New York , NY 10021
USA
E-mail: Nmcberry@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

"I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted."

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 146

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Georgetown, DC 20057
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 147

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Conal P. Groom
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Seattle, WA 98119
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I strongly support designating the NMBZ and all sites indicated. I believe the process has gone on too long. Eight studies I count is sure to be enough data and show of support of the idea and facilities as well as the feasibility. The Washington DC, Potomac River, Georgetown University and GW histories are intrinsically linked. Each University has brought rich resources to the District of Columbia and seems willing to swap valuable river shoreline property for the NMBZ.

While challenges linger I have no doubt they will be resolved in a manner that enhances the Potomac River shoreline, the District of Columbia and the citizens of the surrounding areas.

Please designate the NMBZ and the sites for the GW and Georgetown University sites.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 148

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Hoya Lwt Alumn '11 N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Arlington, VA 22209
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I rowed for Georgetown from 2007-2011 and think that talks of building a boathouse have gone on long enough! We have the money, we have the space, now why can't we work together to build a place where the legacy of Georgetown Crew can continue to grow and flourish and to the best of my knowledge, not be at the detriment to the environment. Give us the tools to succeed!

Speaking of tools...the TBC erg room just doesn't cut it, especially during the winter. Come November when the days start getting cooler, the docks are pulled, the water is turned off and all that remains is the Georgetown Rowing Team to train in a 20 degree room for 4 months and use a rarely cleaned outhouse. If we were lucky we might sneak into Starbucks before practice. We all rejoiced when the days started to warm because that meant running water, rowing

on the water, and restraining yourself from pushing all the millions of highschoolers into the water!

I don't think it is asking too much for a Division 1 University team to want to distinguish themselves from the masses and create a place that allows athletes to focus on what's important - going fast.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 149

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: JP Medved
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DE 20016
USA
E-mail: aducknamedjoe@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be bullshit.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 150

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Chris Wrenn
Organization:

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1216 Lakewood Road, Jacksonville, FL 32207
Jacksonville, FL 32207
USA
E-mail: cwrenn@unf.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As the parent of a rower at Georgetown University, I have followed carefully the evaluative process for a new non-motorized boathouse zone on the shore of the Potomac at Georgetown. I have recently taken the time to review the most recent feasibility study carefully. Sites A, C, D and E seem to be proximate to recreational areas, sensitive to protected areas, and publicly accessible. Having visited the area on numerous occasions, I think sensitively-designed boathouses would add a positive improvement to the area.

I believe in rowing. It is a sport that has meant so much to both of our boys' growth and development for the past six (6) years. It is clean, and it inspires leadership skills and hard work. There are few things I have seen in our nation's capital more beautiful than a crew team gliding up the Potomac under the Key Bridge with the Washington monument in the background. Boathouses facilitate that.

Most rowing teams-both high school and college-have dedicated boathouses. It is surprising to me that two prestigious Washington universities, both of whom have had roots in college rowing going back for decades and who compete nationally, operate without dedicated boathouses. I don't know of any other teams in the Eastern Association of Rowing Colleges who don't have one.

It is my understanding that Georgetown U and GWU each has riverfront property to exchange for one of the sites identified in the study. I urge you to move forward now to make these improvements to the Potomac shoreline.

Thank you for your consideration.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 151

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Charles B. de Pentheny O'Kelly
Organization: Georgetown University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1233 33rd Street NW
Washington, DC 20007

USA

E-mail: cbd23@georgetown.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 152

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Donald S. Whamond
Organization: Georgetown C'61 Georgetown Rowing Assoc.
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 10 Stoneycrest Road
 Rye, NY 10580
 USA
E-mail: DWhamond33@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am among the crew that brought this fine sport back to Georgetown in 1958. From that date we have been seriously discussing the need for a boathouse of our own and most recently, the last 25-30 years, have taken it to the point of meeting and fulfilling all the inquires, studies, survey etc. etc. We are now asked to await yet a 9th study. I believe

that another study after 8 prior and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Please let us bring this to an end and allow there fine young men and women to continue their sport in a facility long overdue.

Thank you for your consideration.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 153**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: [REDACTED]
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: [REDACTED]
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I would be in favor of any of the sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.

Georgetown in particular has strong historical ties to the river and this shoreline. And both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

I graduated from Georgetown in 1999, and at that time an acceptable arrangement for constructing the boathouses was long over due. Now that I live in Philadelphia and see the vibrant high school, college and post-collegiate rowing community on boathouse row, I see what the Potomac is missing. It would be wonderful for the universities and the area for these boathouse to be built in the near future.

It seems to be inefficient and overall unwarranted to call for additional study as eight (8) prior studies have been completed plus 30 years of work.

PLEASE DO NOT SHARE PERSONAL / IDENTIFYING INFORMATION / CONTACT INFORMATION PUBLICLY.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 154**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Caron Cadle
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8719 SW 42nd Place
Gainesville, FL 32608
USA
E-mail: ccadle57@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Friends at the National Park Service,

You may wonder why someone from Florida feels entitled to comment on this subject, but I was born in Washington D.C., spent my earliest years in the DC area and middle school at Sidwell Friends. My father, Don Cadle, was one of Georgetown University's first rowing coaches, and I myself rowed on the Potomac back in 1976 (though for Princeton, and against Georgetown and George Washington Universities, I blush to admit).

The Georgetown rowing community has waited a very long time for a good boathouse. The one built in my father's day was adequate when it was first constructed, but has long been overloaded. All the sites indicated in the Feasibility Study would serve the purpose well. I therefore ask that the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone be designated at last and that sites from among those indicated (A, C, D and E) be assigned to Georgetown and to George Washington. Both these universities are willing to exchange Potomac shoreline property well worth having in return for boathouse sites in a new NBZ.

Those who may end up as neighbors to a new Georgetown or GW boathouse will find that crew people are accustomed to being part of a team and willing and able to work out ways to get along and prosper together. It's not time for another feasibility study, there have been plenty of those: as the old TV show said, "Eight is Enough." The hardworking young people of both universities deserve to be able to continue to pursue their idealistic calling (for rowing is that: no divas need apply) in appropriate surroundings. And crew shells don't leave wakes!

Thanks for letting an old oarswoman (and former Georgetown crew mascot) put in her two cents. I know you have a tough job to do.

Yours sincerely,

Caron Cadle

Gainesville, Florida, USA

currently Berlin, Germany

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 155

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mark Thompson
Organization: Georgetown Rowing Alumnus
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kansas City, MO 64112
USA
E-mail: maebay@sbcglobal.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I personally like all the sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I heartily support designating the "Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone" and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. It is my understanding that both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. Additional study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted and possibly look to be disingenuous and intentionally delaying the proper decision that should be made, i.e., to designate the sites.

Furthermore, the rowing programs at each University have produced countless individuals who have a keen and longstanding interest in the environment and the Potomac due to their involvement on the water and the waterfront. A new boathouse will strengthen and further continue that byproduct of rowing. Please designate the "Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone" and proceed as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University rowing boathouses.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 156

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization: Oxford Brookes
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Oslo, UN 0286
NOR
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 157

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Patrick J. Kaufmann
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 72 Long Ave,
 Belmont, MA 02478
 USA
E-mail: pjkaufmann@msn.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted."

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 158

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization: Georgetown University Rowing
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Bridgewater, NJ 08807
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

To whom it may concern:

I'd like to say thank you for the opportunity to comment on the latest study of the feasibility of a new boathouse on the Georgetown Waterfront. It means so much to me and my team, the Georgetown University rowing program, and I hope that my correspondence, though one among hundreds of others, may shed some light on Georgetown University's stand.

When I moved in for my freshmen year at Georgetown University, I had no idea what rowing was. Somehow, I found my way to Thompson's Boat Center for my first crew practice and since then, I have unregrettably dedicated countless hours to the program. I previously called the Georgetown University rowing program my team but they are much more than that. They are, as cliché as it sounds, my family. We are a family because we are Hoyas and we represent one of the greatest cities in the world. Georgetown University is not a faceless and domineering institution to my family as it may seem to those that live around it. We proudly row for Georgetown University, a school purely invested in developing men and women for others.

Rowing has been a part of Georgetown's identity since its founding in 1876. It is and always will be a part of Washington DC's culture. My crew family and I have spent more hours on the Potomac River than most Washington DC residents will in their lifetimes. It makes perfect sense that such a substantial fixture of this city and in the lives of thousands of Hoyas throughout history have a place to call home. A boathouse is the home away from home for every rower.

Currently, our "home" is Thompson's Boat Center. As an optimist, I see TBC as having "character" and as a place I will look back on in 20 years as the decrepit - excuse me - shithole I spent 4 years hanging around with all my brothers. TBC lacks water supply to the bathrooms half of the school year and air conditioning. We have two boat bays that we must share between the lightweight men's, heavyweight men's, lightweight women's, openweight

women's, and - most inefficiently and inconveniently - local high school teams. Our erg room is a tiny worn-down room with only enough space to accommodate one of our four teams at a time. It is no way to house a competitive rowing program let alone a permanent aspect of Georgetown University's and Washington DC's identity.

When you see Georgetown University pushing for this boathouse, it is not an exercise of the school's muscle. They are fighting for the interests of an underdog. I hate to say it, and a new boathouse would undoubtedly be catalytic of our turnaround, but that's what we are. To quote a poll on row2k.com from the beginning of May 2013: "Georgetown Lightweights deserve the win. They've been through 6 coaching changes in the past 4 years, don't have their own boathouse, and are constantly pushing to overturn their underdog status. If that's not resilience, I don't know what is. My vote goes to the G130s hands down." I pray that that anonymous opinion can soon be popular opinion.

If you go to Philadelphia, Princeton, or Boston, you will see cities proud of their rowing culture evident in their simple but highly efficient and beautiful boathouses. Their pride is reciprocal to the immense pride rowers have for, not just their schools but also, their cities. Us Hoyas chose to attend Georgetown University because we love Washington DC. We spend infinite hours on a death machine called an erg, we get hungry, and we brave some awful weather conditions because when we're crushing it on the Potomac on an absolutely gorgeous day, it is all worth it. We value and respect the beauty and the health of this city more than most think we do.

Now, you wake up in the morning and endure the rush hour to work for what? To survive, and - if you're lucky - to feel that intrinsic pride of success. Rowers are the same. Rowers will wake up at 5:00 in the morning and bike to the boathouse for another session of pain and struggle before class, for a hard-fought success that may or may not come. We are full-time students, full-time Hoyas, full-time athletes and truly full-time citizens of Washington DC. Though we may not be as fast as we were in previous years, the Georgetown University rowing program will never cease. We will never give up but it doesn't help when an entire city pushes us down. I think 8 studies over the past 30 years have provided all the information necessary. On behalf of my team - my family - and all the Hoya rowers before me, all I ask for is empathy when making your decisions.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 159**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: philip J. mause
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DC 20016
USA
E-mail: philip.j.mause@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have been a District of Columbia resident for over 40 years and my wife and I often visit the area under consideration. I also served as a staff attorney for the Environmental Defense Fund and represented that organization in certain legal proceedings involving the construction of facilities on the Potomac River. I think that the development of boathouses in the area under consideration would be a positive development and I support the creation of a Non Motorized Boathouse Zone and the prompt approval of sites for Georgetown University and George Washington. The activities of rowing teams would add to the recreational and other hedonic benefits associated with the best use of this area. Boathouse Row in Philadelphia has become an iconic destination and increases the appreciation of an environmentally protected river zone.

It is important that the sound and sustainable development of the Potomac move forward so that the public appreciation of this historic resource will continue and strengthen. For that reason, promptness in the approval process is desirable in light of the fact that boathouses really present no negative impacts on the zone.

It is also important that the District of Columbia continue to experience sound development of in-city locations so as to encourage more residency in the District, less urban sprawl, and less fuel consumption in commuting. Undue delay in this regard has the effect of driving more and more activities out to the distant suburbs and producing unsustainable sprawl. In this connection, boathouses would produce a more vibrant and interesting environment in this area and would enhance the continued development of Washington as a city which is attractive for residents,

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 160

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Albert A. DiFiore

Organization: Georgetown Rowing Alumni and Society of the Golden Oar

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address: 12 Classic Court
North Kingstown, RI 02852
USA

E-mail: aadf711@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for the Georgetown

University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Yours truly,
Albert A. DiFiore
Georgetown University
Foreign Service 1961
Law 1964

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 161**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Michael Kelley
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 7055 W. Higgins
Chicgao, IL 60646
USA
E-mail: mpatrickkelley@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

All of the sites recommended in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses are acceptable. I believe that a designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone would be very beneficial to the city of Washington, DC and its citizens- all of its citizens. The shoreline area should be opened up so that more people may enjoy that area, not just those who belong to the clubs currently located in that area. I would ask that sites be designated as quickly as possible for Georgetown University and George Washington University. Any more studies after the eight that have already been undertaken would seem to be an extravagant waste of valuable resources.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 162**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization: Georgetown University

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

Washington, DC 20007
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have been a firm proponent of a Boathouse for Georgetown University for years. Based on this survey, I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. I know quite well that the roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. It is silly to think that more study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be warranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 163

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mark Michalowski
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Arlington, VA 22201
USA
E-mail: mark.michalowski@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear NPS,

I have been a rower on the upper and lower Potomac since the mid-1970s. Since that time, even though crew has grown in popularity and expanded to numerous new high schools and colleges, there has been very little expansion of facilities on the Georgetown or adjacent waterfront lands. The result has been overcrowding of existing facilities, unsightly sheds and fenced boat yards, and potentially a damper on the total potential growth and recreational use of the river.

As one who still occasionally gets the opportunity to row with friends and colleagues on the Potomac, I wholeheartedly support the implementation of a plan to expand boathouse facilities for non-motorized boats along the Georgetown waterfront. I believe it is long overdue and will promote the sport of crew, athletic capability of our youth (and older ages), and the health and well being of DC and its waterfront.

Very respectfully,
Mark Michalowski

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 164

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Thad Glavin
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
San Francisco, CA 94010
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Thompson's is overcrowded and both Universities have the means to self-fund buildings which alleviates impact on tax payers.

Thank you!

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 165**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Palo Alto, CA 94303
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 166**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Lauren Abrams
Organization: Georgetown Women's Rowing
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DC 20007
USA

University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted."

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 168**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Victoria P. Stulgis
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1 Prescott St
Boston, MA 02129
USA
E-mail: vps5@georgetown.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Seven years ago when I was visiting college on recruiting visits, I was told by the Georgetown coaches, we have millions of dollars pledged to build the boathouse, and I was showed the designs.

In my four years as a varsity athlete at a Division I University, I trained in a shared boathouse with the rest of Washington DC. The rowing community in Washington DC deserves this boathouse to alleviate the stress on TBC. The Georgetown community deserves this boathouse. And the current rowers and squads who currently train countless hours in a building not fit for purpose, deserve this boathouse.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 169**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington, DC 20007

date back well into the 1800s. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 171**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington , DC 20001
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

"I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted."

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 172**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Brandt Witt
Organization: Georgetown University Lightweight Crew
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3416 N. St. NW
Washington, PA 20007
USA
E-mail: baw43@georgetown.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The Feasibility Study has been comprehensive in its scope, and, in combination with the 8 other studies and the past 30 years doing so, is quite sufficient. I have found that all sites that the study indicates could be used for rowing boathouses, namely A, C, D, and E, not only are ideal for boathouses, but in actuality should be used for boathouses. Indeed, they should be put to use for boathouses. They are presently sitting empty, and some of the sites (such as to the east of the freeway) are vacant parking lots, full of overgrowth and trash. Put bluntly, some of the sites are an eyesore--establishing university boathouses in the aforementioned sites will only serve to enhance the surrounding area and bring more flavor to the waterfront with the architectural beauty that is sure to be put on display.

I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 173

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
 Bethlehem, NY 12054
 USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 174

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kayla M. McNeill
Organization: Georgetown University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3429 O st NW
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail: km495@georgetown.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 175

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kendra Follett
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1130 Sentinel Circle

Reno, NV 89509
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013	Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form
Notes:	

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. I rowed for Georgetown for 4 years. I return frequently to DC and always visit the Potomac. I recently returned to the Potomac for a rowing reunion in April 2013. During the rowing reunion, I was pleased to see many user groups enjoying the Potomac including a high school rowing regatta and a collegiate rowing regatta and support the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back to the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Regards, Kendra Follett

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 176

Author Information

Keep Private:	No
Name:	Ruthie F. Speidel
Organization:	Georgetown Lightweight Crew Team
Organization Type:	I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:	
	Syracuse, NY 13104
	USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013	Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form
Notes:	

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 177

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Benjamin Sacher
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4101 W st NW
Apt. 301
Washington DC, DC 20007
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 178

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Edward P. Witman
Organization:

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

Toms River, NJ 08753
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please let this be the last study of this proposed plan.

The Georgetown University Boat House project has been studied beyond the point of exhaustion, and the time has come to approve the plan and move forward to build it!

Any further delay must raise the question of bad faith obstructionism.

Any of the proposed sites would be acceptable, and infinitely better than more temporizing.

Get it built.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 179

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Tom J. Brzozowski
Organization: Georgetown University Rowing Team
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 423 Diana Court
Highland Heights, OH 44143
USA
E-mail: tjb91@georgetown.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 180

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Luke Brzozowski
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
New York, NY 10036
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 181

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Len Brzozowski
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

Highland Heights, OH 44143
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 182

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Cathy Brzozowski
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
 Highland Heights, OH 44143
 USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the

Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 183**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Peter Foley
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Post Office Box 812245
Wellesley, MA 02482
USA
E-mail: pfoley@benefitstar.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

A former rower, I served as President of Georgetown Rowing Alumni for two years in the late 1980s. I followed the significant efforts of several who preceded me, and did my tiny part as an unofficial advocate in support of the professional staff of Georgetown University and other rowing-related parties who shared a common goal of a rowing boathouse that would include river access for more than just Georgetown.

I offer five observations in an attempt to clear the air and allow for some common sense to rule the day:

1. Environmentalism and Shared Use: All nonmotorized boating supporters have demonstrated a distinct environmental consciousness from the beginning. Why? All were initially concerned that the river might otherwise one day become a motorboat/ yacht mess. Let's not accept any notions that any modern rowing boathouses are bad for the environment; rather, I cannot imagine a better incubator for environmentally-conscious young minds than expanded access to rowing. I keep thinking of the experience of rowing past herons by the shore amidst the beauty of the first streaks of sun breaking through the mist on the Potomac. Immersion does not get any better.
2. Access: The sport of rowing continues to grow, especially for women. Access to the uncommon qualities of the protected, upper segment of the DC Potomac river, by all metrics, is drastically limited and begs a long term solution.
3. Precedents: Having observed the construction of boathouses in public spaces, in Boston, for Northeastern University, Boston University, Community Rowing, and an expansion of Cambridge Boat Club in recent years, with

overwhelmingly (dare I say universally?) successful results, I have wondered: Can any of those opposed to the DC boathouse developments cite any precedents that should effectively postpone or even kill the current boathouse initiatives?

4. History: The history of a boathouse row in DC is not fiction; the photographic documentation is archived in the Main DC Public Library, in the Washingtoniana Special Connection. I have reviewed these holdings and encourage all to do the same. The DC boathouse row once was an uninterrupted structure that connected Potomac Boat Club to the Canoe Club, notwithstanding the old bridge base. These photos are not online, as far as I am aware. By the way, there was a boathouse row photo, circa 1920, hanging on the wall upstairs in the 1789 restaurant for many years, and might still be there.

Website for Washingtoniana Collection: <http://dclibrary.org/node/2289>

5. Neighbors: A regrettable part of the picture before us is the apparent lack of cooperation between colleges, and perhaps worse on the part of the Canoe Club and the C&O Canal Association toward fair discussions about shared uses of river access and win-win scenarios. Unfortunately, the gutter sniping carried on by some Canoe Club types about rowers has been simply an accepted fact of life for rowers for decades. I would ask Canoers: How many people actually have access to the Potomac via your club? How many of those are women, youth, minorities, adaptive types, or the underprivileged? Comparing numbers might inject some fairness to sets of "talking points" out there. As to the C&O Canal Association, they have not been fair on this topic. I would ask: Have any of their members ever experienced a regatta day in shared use waterfront parks in Philadelphia, Boston, Camden, or New York?

During my volunteer days, I was once promised an opportunity to develop an unofficial dialogue with the C&O Canal Association by one of their senior officials, after we had a positive preliminary discussion and it seemed a common vision was eminently possible. But after too many attempts, I realized the offer was purely perfunctory. I could relate, but I was crystal clear when I related to the official that rowers knew that the C&O Association's policy, that they welcomed a boathouse farther downstream was just fine, was effectively a knife being applied to our kidneys.

I regret having to share some of this, but I feel that it is time to stop the nonsense and declare misinformation off limits. Rowing has been proven, over more than 100 years, that it is the best and most environmentally sound continuous anchor use of the upper DC Potomac. New boathouses will allow many thousands who have been unfairly locked out of adequate river access for too long, especially women and the underprivileged. The use is historically grounded. The upper DC segment of the Potomac was once one of the most prized rowing venues in America. It could be again. The prospective Georgetown and George Washington boathouses will enhance the experiences of all who share the area. Stop the nonsense and get it done.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 184

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: John Carlson
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 28 Atlantic Ave
Boston
Boston, MA 02110
USA
E-mail: John.H.Carlson@fmr.com

No one has more respect and concern for the health of a river than a rowing crew. The net effect of a rowing crew on any body of water is positive for the health of the waterway and its surroundings, and the Potomac River is no exception. Rowing crews clean up tons of debris from the Potomac River each year. Team members and coaches are extremely alert to any unhealthy conditions in the waterway or along the shoreline. The rowing crews on the Potomac survey the navigable waterway many times a day from the immediate vantage point of the waterline. They see things that no shore-based observer can perceive, and they take action. In addition to their daily diligence, they typically conduct seasonal clean-up tasks after heavy surges of the river. A modern facility along the Georgetown waterfront will eliminate most of the vehicle traffic that any team members currently use in order to get from the campus area to the Thompson boat center. A Georgetown facility near the Key Bridge will convey a visible commitment of the university toward the health of the river, the canal, and the park.

The NPS and other parties appear to be doing their utmost to show due diligence and analysis of all points of view. This is certainly important, but there is a point of diminishing returns and a risk of "analysis paralysis" if the authorities decide to undertake yet another new study. The studies and meetings have been going on for about 3 decades now. Please proceed with designation of the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone, and set the conditions for a new boathouse to proceed.

Thanks again for posting the report, and for providing this opportunity to offer comments.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 186

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
New York, NY 10004
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for

designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 187

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Margaret Rush
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3429 O Street
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 188

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Glenn J. Farris
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2425 Elendil Lane
Davis, CA 95616
USA
E-mail: farris@dcn.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am in favor of all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. Having rowed at Georgetown for four years in the early 1960s out of the Thompson Boat House, I remember looking longingly at the area above Key Bridge and dreaming of how nice it would be to have a real boathouse row similar to the one found on the Schuylkill River in Philadelphia. It would be a land use in keeping with the historical nature of river and the adjacent river banks on the Georgetown side of the river. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted."

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 189

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Julia Butz
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:

 Washington , DC 20057
 USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline

date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 190**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Patrick O. Lacey
Organization: Potomac Boat Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2535 Queen Anne's Lane NW
Washington, DC 20037
USA
E-mail: patrick.lacey@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/22/2013 Date Received: 05/22/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am strongly in favor of the move to create a non-motorized boathouse zone. This will enable the Georgetown and GW crews to vastly improve the quality of their training and afford them opportunities for better performance on the national scale. It will free up more space at Thompson Boat Center to allow for more teams to gain a foothold on the Potomac and expand the sport of rowing. It will also help develop a better relationship between the community and the river and foster a culture of sport and well-being among members of the community.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 191**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mary Beth Haberkorn
Organization: Georgetown University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 86 Bolton Rd.
Harvard, MA 01451
USA
E-mail: mhaberkorn@charter.net

in detail, presented or evaluated.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 193**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization: DC Water (DC Clean Rivers)
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 5000 Overlook Avenue, Washington, DC @0032
Washington, DC 20032
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The plan presented as scenario 1 would be in conflict with proposed DC Water CSO Control facilities for the Potomac in the vicinity of CSO 028. A building on Site C would be in conflict with the proposed tunnel drop shaft, diversion structure and associated pipelines. Also depending on the final tunnel alignment it is likely that the future buildings on Site A and C under scenario 1 would be located directly above the tunnel.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 194**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Rudy Ruggles
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Weston, MA 02493
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I was a rower at Georgetown for four years and am looking forward to returning for my 25th reunion later this month. The Potomac is a beautiful river to row on, but the Thompson facility has become too crowded and congested. The waterfront would actually be enhanced, both aesthetically and practically, by the development of rowing boathouses on any of the sites (A, C, D, and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study. Not only would this alleviate the traffic at the Thompson location, the universities have a vested interest in making sure that any development in these new sites would be attractive and consistent with the natural beauty of the river and its environment.

I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Rowers returning for reunions like to go out on a Saturday morning row while we are in town. Although it will be nice to see friends and fellow rowers from throughout the years, I sincerely hope that this will be the last major reunion I go to where we launch from Thompson's. The study results are in, the discussions have happened, and now it's time to move ahead and create the facilities that the Potomac deserves.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 195

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kyla N. McClure
Organization: Georgetown Rowing
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 345 Village C West
 Georgetown University
 Washington, DC 20057
 USA
E-mail: mcclurekyla@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date from the mid 1800's. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 196

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Madeline L. Towle
Organization: Washington Kayak Meetup Group
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 14722 Southwarke Place
Centreville, VA 20120
Centreville, VA 20120
USA
E-mail: mltowle@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support the Low and Medium Density Plans, which would establish a Car-top Boat Launch Area and Visitor Parking at Zone C with parking solely for public use: no reserved private (or established kayak club) parking.

I also support a shorter boat dock structure at Zone C, if there is to be one at all. The current Low and Med Density plans display a ~200' boat dock that spans the entire waterfront at this site. This is too long.

Thank you for allowing the voices of recreational and sea kayakers to be heard.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 197

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Laura B. Broughton

Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 613 Stevenson Lane
Towson, MD 21286
USA
E-mail: lrbroughton@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

May 23, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

Over 30 years ago, I grew up in Virginia, where I attended St. Agnes School in Alexandria and the Madeira School in Greenway. During that time, I learned how to sail on the Potomac River and would jog on a path paralleling the George Washington Parkway. I remember when the Chesapeake Bay Foundation among other community and business organizations focused attention and financial resources toward improving the quality of the water in the Potomac. I recall how the citizens of Alexandria recognized the value of improving the city's waterfront by approving the building of a boathouse, which is now the home of several strong public and private high school rowing teams. Later as an undergraduate and graduate student at George Washington University in the District of Columbia, I continued to enjoy jogging beside the Potomac River watching sailboats and crew boats practicing early in the morning and in the afternoon. I worked in the District during high school and undergraduate and graduate school and wondered why the District of Columbia did not follow Virginia's lead in promoting outdoor recreation on the Potomac because this encouraged people to improve the quality of the water and the shoreline. As a side note, both my uncle and mother attended George Washington University and were active alumni in supporting the university's development resulting in its international influence and prestige.

Now I am a parent of a senior on the Georgetown University Heavyweight Crew Team, which competes at the Division I level. Although he was recruited by several universities including Ivy League schools, he chose Georgetown for many reasons including his love for our Nation's Capitol. He and I had hoped the National Park Service would approve Georgetown's building of a boathouse that would attract student-athletes with Olympic potential to come to study and train at Georgetown. Rowing is celebrated internationally like Americans celebrate football, basketball, golf, and ice hockey. Designating an area on the Potomac River to nonmotorized use for boathouses will encourage recognition of our Nation's Capitol as an attractive venue for international training and competition on the Potomac.

I understand that there have been eight studies over 30 years resulting in the most recent Feasibility Study. I like all of the sites (A, C, D, and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. Georgetown University's connection to the Potomac River's shoreline dates back well into the 19th century.

For all of these personal, environmental, and historic reasons, I encourage you to proceed as soon as possible to

designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.
Sincerely,
Laura R. B. Broughton

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 198**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: peter c. mcguire
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 117 Catalan Blvd, st petersburg, FL 33704
st petersburg, FL 33704
USA
E-mail: petercmcguire@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

PETER C. MCGUIRE
117 CATALAN BLVD
ST PETERSBURG, FL 33704
727-902-1809
petercmcguire@yahoo.com

May 23, 2013

Mr. Peter May
Assistant Regional Director
US Department of Interior
Washington, DC 20240

Re: NPS Feasibility Study for Development of Potomac River
PEPC Project ID 39727

Dear Mr. May,

I started living in Georgetown in 1965. I loved the Potomac but the shoreline at the time north of Rock Creek was a disgrace. The only sane individuals that would venture to the area were rowers and the very occasional adventuresome hiker. Not until the mid 1980's with the advent of private development sensitive to public access did the shoreline become the haven for recreation that it is today. I have reviewed the NPS Feasibility Study and heartedly endorse the High Density Alternative. This alternative is a sensible approach to preserving, yet enhancing this shoreline with the potential for maximizing recreational use for the largest segment of the area population, very similar to the paths taken by the New York Harbor development and the Presidio of San Francisco. I have also read with great interest the public comments of those that oppose further development. While they are obviously sincere in their concerns, those concerns are misplaced and their references to lofty ideals of preservation are simply out of touch with how preservation really is achieved.

Very truly yours,

Peter C. McGuire

Former resident of Georgetown, now retired to St Petersburg, FL.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 199**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Derek H. Miller
Organization: Capital SUP Meetup
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2508 Childs Lane
Alexandria, VA
Alexandria, VI 22308
USA
E-mail: dekemiller@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support the Low and Medium Density Plans, which would establish a Car-top SUP Launch Area and Visitor Parking at Zone C with parking solely for public use: no reserved private (or established kayak club) parking.

I also support a shorter boat dock structure at Zone C, if there is to be one at all. The current Low and Med Density plans display a ~200" boat dock that spans the entire waterfront at this site. This is too long.

Thank you for allowing the voices of SUP paddlers to be heard.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 200**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Randi Kruger
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 7932 Gambrill Ct
West Springfield, VA 22153
USA
E-mail: washingtonkayak@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a local sea kayaker who values the Potomac River and its tributaries.

I support the Low and Medium Density Plans, which would establish a Car-top Boat Launch Area and Visitor Parking at Zone C with parking solely for public use: no reserved private (or established kayak club) parking.

I also support a shorter boat dock structure at Zone C, if there is to be one at all. The current Low and Med Density plans display a ~200" boat dock that spans the entire waterfront at this site. This is too long.

Thank you for allowing the voices of recreational and sea kayakers to be heard.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 201**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Stephen T. Bethke
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Association (CPA)
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Silver Spring, MD 20910
USA
E-mail: sbethke@rcn.com

I fondly remember my days rowing on the Potomac as an undergraduate at Georgetown University at the end of the 80s. Rowing provided a genuine way to appreciate the beauty of the Potomac, from the serenity and relative isolation North of Key Bridge to the view of the monuments to the South. This intense enjoyment of nature as a practical matter would not have been accessible through another means as a college student in the District of Columbia. This passion has carried through to this day as someone who works to preserve, enjoy, and enhance my local watersheds. Increasing access will grow the number of people that truly care for the quality of the Potomac and other waterways.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 203**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Howard G. McClintic
Organization: DC Resident; Potomac(k) Paddler & Sailor
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2925 Rittenhouse St, NW
DC 20015
Washington, DC 20015
USA
E-mail: mcclinth@ctc.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To Whom It May Concern:

As a DC Resident, and lifelong Potomac(k) River Paddler & Sailor,

Respectfully and foremost, I want to bring to your attention an architectural rendering of Erik Kramer, a recent Graduate of the GMU School of Architecture The URL for a synopsis of Erik's idea is http://www.ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis.jpg. The full up rendering is very large and may take up too much memory. If you need to be in touch with him, his firm's email is kramer@eightinc.com. His Plan and Rationale are well worth seriously reviewing and strongly considering -- his Vision is compelling!

Otherwise, I want to associate with this general proposition:

"I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted."

I am grateful for your consideration and re-emphasize your review of Mr. Kramer's thoughtful as well as creative Proposal for the development of the Georgetown and corresponding Virginia waterfronts as embodied herein http://www.ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis.jpg.

Most sincerely yours,

An Avid Veteran Lifelong Paddler, Sailor & Waterfront Enthusiast, Resident of NW DC

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 204**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: David Wilson
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Baltimore, MD 21236
USA
E-mail: David.wilson.bmd@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear NPS,

I sea kayak and am responding to the Georgetown waterfront issue.

Most recreational paddlers have minimal needs.

- Parking for vehicles.
- Access to the water.
- A sandy beach to launch from

Additional amenities might include a port-a-potty.

It is difficult to understand that the National Park Service would even consider a plan for the Georgetown waterfront that does not include public access for recreational paddlers. Isn't this property public land?

Thanks for listening.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 205**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mihail Popov
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Bethesda, MD 20814
USA
E-mail: mihail_popov@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear NPS,

I enjoy the water sports such as canoeing, kayaking, rowing, and standup paddling. (SUP). Most recreational paddlers have minimal needs to enjoy our activities:

- Parking for vehicles,
- Access to the water.

A sandy beach is even better for us than a boat ramp. Grass is okay if the waters edge is not muddy and has a firm

bottom.

Additional amenities that are nice to have are a bit of green space with picnic tables/grills, bathroom/running water or a port-a-potty, and a trash receptacle.

It is difficult to understand that the National Park Service would even consider a plan for the Georgetown waterfront that does not include public access for recreational paddlers. The waterfront is public land, yes?

Thanks for the many good things that you do to care for our national resources and make them available for all of us to enjoy, today and tomorrow.

Sincerely,
Mihail Popov

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024 Correspondence: 206

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: elizabeth marancik
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 10533 Apple Ridge Rd
Gaithersburg, MD 20886
USA
E-mail: NEMAS@COMCAST.NET

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support Scenarios for Low and Medium Density plans, which will establish a Car-top Boat Launch Area and Visitor Parking at Zone C.

With a shorter boat dock at Zone C.

I definitely am in favor of public access for non-motorized boats on the Potomac

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024 Correspondence: 207

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Matt Lavin
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 208

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Philip B. Miller
Organization: Philip B. Miller Associates
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
150 Zaccheus Mead Lane
Greenwich, CT 06831-3750
USA
E-mail: pbm@philipmillerassoc.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am writing in support of designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and would like the sites indicated in the Feasibility Study be designated for Georgetown University and George Washington University at the earliest possible time.

Both universities have a long heritage on the Potomac river and have valuable shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 209

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kenneth M. Hamilton
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 602 Roundtree Ct
Sykesville, MD 21784
USA
E-mail: khamilto@umd.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Borrowing from Steve Bethke's comments (which I agree with):

Dear NPS,

I enjoy the water sport of sea kayaking. Most recreational paddlers have minimal needs to enjoy our activities.

- Parking for vehicles.
- Access to the water.

A sandy beach is even better for us than a boat ramp. Grass is okay if the waters edge is not muddy and has a firm bottom.

An additional amenities are: a bit of green space, a port-a-potty, and a trash receptacle.

It is difficult to understand that the National Park Service would even consider a plan for the Georgetown waterfront

that does not include public access for recreational paddlers. The waterfront is public land, yes?

Thanks for the many good things that you do to care for our national resources and make them available for all of us to enjoy, today and tomorrow.

Additional comments:

As an American Canoe Association (ACA) Kayak Instructor and member, I support increased public access to the Potomac River for self propelled watercraft.

K. Michael Hamilton
University of Maryland

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 210

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kate Finnerty
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 470 N. Thomas St. #315
Arlington, VA 22203
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 211

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Curt Weinstein
Organization: Former Georgetown Student CAS '84 /Rower
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1408 Riff Road
Corning, NY 14830
USA
E-mail: weinsteic@corning.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

It has been nearly 30 years since I rowed on the Potomac and it is shocking to me that the discussion around the siting of a boathouse has gone on for those 3 decades. The river is an amazing resource that should be made accessible to the GU and GW crew teams. I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 212

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Rachel Pacheco
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Philadelphia, PA 19103
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Hi, I am a frequent rower and kayaker of the Potomac. I live in Philadelphia which has a thriving boathouse community which is a huge asset to the city and a source of pride for residents and tourists alike. I believe the Georgetown waterfront would benefit immensely from a boathouse zone.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 213

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: N/A N/A

Organization:

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

Arlington, VA 22201
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am both an alum of Georgetown University and The George Washington University. I am also a resident of Arlington, VA and work in Georgetown. As an alum of these universities I fully support their endeavors to provide their students with the best resources and equipment possible to be successful. As an area resident, I fully support the plans allowing these boathouses to be built. At the end of the project, the Georgetown waterfront will be as iconic as other famous rivers, just like Boathouse Row in Philadelphia and the waterfront on the Charles River. Most importantly, as a former rower of Georgetown University, I wholeheartedly support the plans for any of these sites (A, C, D, and E). Georgetown crew has been a second family to me ever since my first day on the Potomac, over ten years ago. The sport, unlike any other, fosters teamwork, discipline, perseverance, integrity, and dignity. My old

coach used to say, "rowing is not about winning medals; it's about building character," and Georgetown crew does just that. The student athletes who call the Potomac "home" would appreciate, respect, and care for their new space because it is their home away from home and the space that will teach them some of life's most important lessons. The university has been working diligently for over 30 years to make this dream a reality and it's time to find a resolution.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 214**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Susan VanHaften
Organization: C&O Canal Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 944 N. Potomac Street
Arlington, VA 22205
Arlington, VA 22205
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I strongly believe that there should be no new private development within the C&O Canal National Historical Park. The Park was established for the enjoyment of all people, and any facilities within the bounds of the Park should be open to all and operated by the National Park Service.

Of the proposals presented, only the Low Density Proposal protects the natural, historic, and cultural resources of the C&O Canal National Historical Park. There was a long and hard-fought battle to establish the Park in the first place. Justice Douglas was right when he said "It is a refuge, a place of retreat, a long stretch of quiet and peace at the capital's back door."

This study will lay the groundwork for future decision making. It's critical that we get it right now, and do what is necessary and right to protect the Park for future generations. Should planning for a non-motorized boathouse zone proceed, the only option that makes any sense is the Low-Density Option.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 215**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 216

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Arlington, VA 22201
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a lifelong area resident (MD, DC, and VA), I have watched the debate about the Georgetown waterfront go on for my entire adulthood. The older I get, the more childish opposition to building boathouses on the Potomac seems, and it appears to me that opponents of the boathouses have employed the adult version of a temper tantrum to deprive other members of the wider community the opportunity to enjoy rowing and other activities on the Potomac.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses, and I think the high density plan makes sense as more and more people move to Washington. Furthermore, despite the obvious opposition, many other cities with rivers have beautiful boathouses lining those rivers, so it seems to me that vehement opposition to the same thing in our nation's capital seems excessive. After decades of debate, it is time to move forward!

Furthermore, I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century, and it remains one of the most prominent members of the local community. Much ire has been directed at the universities, but both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

In conclusion, enough is enough. The Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone is long overdue, and we should no longer cater to a vocal few special interest groups who do not want to share the shoreline.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 217

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Kensington, MD 20895
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 218

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: William W. Upton
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2802 Lookout Trail
Huntingtown, MD 20639
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Having a non-motorized boathouse zone would be very beneficial to the large and growing paddling community in the Washington DC area. i support the proposed use.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 219

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Laura Beaufort
Organization: TBC
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington, DC 20009
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a DC native and have been rowing out of Thompson boat center for almost 15 years. I rowed at TBC as a high schooler at Wilson High School and later as a member of TBC's club. The boathouse is exceptionally crowded, and some schools that would like to start programs are unable to because of the space Georgetown takes up at the boathouse. I support Georgetown's new boathouse. It would be a wonderful addition to a part of the city that is underutilized.

Sincerely,
Laura

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 220**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: C. Michael Tarone
Organization: Lawyer
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 5506 Kirkwood Drive
 Washington , DC 2006
 USA
E-mail: cmtarone@bcounsel.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please hear me out.

I rowed at GU 50 years ago (and I incorporated The Canoe Club).

I have been on waterfront as a rower 50 years, practice in town and love Georgetown and our city. I want bikers,

hikers, canoers, boaters of all kinds to enjoy our rich heritage on the Potomac. I ask you to deal fairly with the GU crew boathouse, since we are among those who love use this great river.

Please approve the Feasibility Study for Georgetown and GW. If you do, you will enhance and preserve the usages of non-rowers. The uses are consistent and complimentary but at this time, crew has been denied facilities it needs that will not interfere with others. I ask you to approve the non-motorized zone, such as sites A, C, D and E.

Boathouses will make the waterfront and be as important as Boathouse Row in Philadelphia.

If you delay, it will be justice denied, and it would play into the hands of the wrong interests with the wrong intentions.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 221**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
cleveland, OH 44140
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

All sites in the study are acceptable. The Georgetown crew team is the strongest band of brothers on campus and as alumni. Please proceed asap to designate sites for the boathouse. Thanks

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 222**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:

Newtown Square, PA 19073
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013	Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a current Georgetown rower, I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 223

Author Information

Keep Private:	No
Name:	Michael T. Altman
Organization:	
Organization Type:	I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:	San Francisco, CA 94129 USA
E-mail:	m.t.altman@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013	Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.

I rowed at Georgetown as an undergraduate, and went on to compete at two Olympic Games. I have competed on racecourses all over the world. My experience rowing has shaped my life considerably, providing amazing opportunities to supplement my education at Georgetown. I have been able to use my experiences to become a community leader in many ways, through volunteer work, coaching, fundraising for a variety of non-profit organizations dedicated to providing opportunities for disadvantaged youth.

I feel very strongly that a strong rowing program provides opportunities to develop these kind of community members, given the selfless dedication that rowing requires. I have competed all over the world and trained and raced with people from virtually every program in the country. I can say with certainty that Georgetown's program needs an upgrade, as the facilities make a huge difference to the experience. I support Georgetown's rowing program today to try to provide the same opportunities for talented young athletes to have the type of formative experiences that I had. It's challenging and discouraging to athletes that work so hard to be consistently denied opportunities the opportunity to build a boathouse in which they can take pride. The right facility will make a huge difference for the program, and be an investment in future community leaders.

I urge that the University be permitted to invest in the future of the program and the community. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 224**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Joseph K. Dowley
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: c/o McKenna Long & Aldridge, LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.,
Washington, DC 20006
USA
E-mail: jdowley@mckennalong.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a Potomac River boater for over 20 years, I have spent many peaceful and memorable times in the "no motor" zone north of the Memorial Bridge. I respect and understand the desire of those wishing to maintain the shoreline and calmness we all associate with that portion of the River. I believe that the addition of boathouses for rowers, including for my alma mater, Georgetown, would enhance the atmosphere already present by virtue of the sport and tradition represented (which, after all, is solely powered by the quiet exertions of those manning the oars!), and would make the City of Washington a greater presence and venue in this world-class sport. We are a world-class city, but if you compare our facilities in this specific regard with those of Boston, and Philadelphia, for example, we are lacking measurably. I believe there are options for swapping land with the NPS that should be seriously considered if the specific approach suggested by Georgetown is not acceptable. This kind of use will enhance the vision of the Potomac as a recreational asset and complement recent improvements in the visual aspects of that portion of the river such as the park adjacent to our outdoor restaurants and the nearby docks.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 225

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Diane Greer
Organization: Georgetown University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Winston-Salem, NC 27103
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
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 the Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study. I support the more intensive uses of Sites A, C, D and E in the nonmotorized boathouse zone and urge getting the boathouses approved and built as quickly as possible. Thirty years of study is long enough.

I'm a Georgetown University alumna and a women's crew alumna, having rowed by freshman and sophomore years. Crew was important to me. It took someone who had never participated in sports before and made a modest athlete out of her. Pushing my physical limits, teamwork, discipline, and accountability have benefited me as an adult. Going to bed by 11:00 p.m. in the dorm so you could get up at 5:00 a.m. and run down to Thompson's Boat Center to be on the water by 6:00 a.m. also took dedication. And watching the sun rise over the Potomac, especially through the arches of Key Bridge, was awe inspiring, and sometimes a small reward after a hard piece.

My first concern is the Georgetown University boathouse, but there is an overall need for more space for George Washington University and the high school crew programs. This includes space to store shells, equipment and launches, dock space, parking, and locker rooms. Some of my teammates had 8:00 a.m. classes and had to go to class in wet, sweaty clothes. My coaches both had full-time day jobs. A place to shower and change would have been wonderful for all of them.

In my opinion, the data in the feasibility study support the high and medium intensive uses of Sites A, C, D and E. I was also surprised to read that the land that makes up these sites is fill material from decades ago and that plants and any water bodies on them are not native but came later. To me, that means that construction of boathouses for rowers in the Georgetown nonmotorized boathouse zone would not be destroying the environment. At the same time it would be contributing to an invaluable experience for students.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 226**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Erich J. Hoefer
Organization: Georgetown University Rowing Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Herndon, VA 20171
USA
E-mail: hoef@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To whom it may concern:

I am writing in support of development of a future boathouse on each of the sites indicated in the Feasibility Study. I would strongly urge the NPS to move quickly to grant approvals for Georgetown University and George Washington University to make use of these respective sites.

I was a rower at Georgetown for three years from 1991 through 1995. It represented an incredible growth experience for me and my time with the rowing team helped to make me who I am today. The bonds I formed with my fellow teammates lasts today as does my affection and identity with the Potomac. As a rower, my teammates and I would not only take care to limit our own impact - but frequently would fish out trash and debris we would find on and near

the river as we would work out each day. The river and shoreline are deeply embedded into the rowing experience and proceeding with a responsibly designed boathouse would preserve both the tradition of rowing on the Potomac and provide this experience for generations to come.

Discussions regarding this project has gone on for decades. After 8 prior studies, yet further study will likely yield little to no benefit. This project will enhance the Potomac river experience and it will create an environment to support future leaders.

Best regards,

Erich Hoefler
VP, Corporate Development & Innovation
Choice Hotels International
Georgetown University, BSFS, Class of 1995

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 227**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Patrick Whelan
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Springfield, VA 22150
USA
E-mail: patrickw_@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support the Low and Medium Density Plans:
- A Car-top Boat Launch Area
- Visitor Parking at Zone C (with parking solely for public use: no reserved private parking.

I also support a shorter boat dock structure at Zone C than the current Low/Med Density 200-foot dock.

Thank you for allowing the voices of recreational and sea kayakers to be heard.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 228

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Lawrence C. Schuette
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1203 Raymond Ave
McLean, VA 22101
USA
E-mail: lawrence.schuette@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Sirs,

I have watched this process as an active WCC member and now a father of 5 young children who hasn't paddled in years but still spends most weekends in the C&O Canal NHP. The Canal Park is a National treasure and the NPS must put the Canal and preserving it ahead of the new recreational opportunities that the river provides.

Accordingly I prefer the low density option. However, I think the best use for site C, regardless of what option is selected for other sites is the parking lot/public ramp option. That will be exceedingly popular and wouldn't effect the sight lines, or endanger the Canal.

I was very concerned that I was unable to find the maximum roof line heights of Site A and Site C in the study. I don't believe they were articulated, nor the ramp heights. Frankly, if true (I may have missed them, and thus I apologize) this is suspicious given the tremendous history of this issue. Accordingly, I believe Superintendent Farris was correct on April 9th, 1996 when he dictated that the height at Site A would be the same as WCC and no higher. The NPS mission of protecting scenic views must not be violated and designs of boathouses have been shown that would both allow boat storage and not be above WCC at Site B. The final study needs to be updated to reflect the heights that NPS believes are appropriate for the public to provide comment on. This should not be left to zoning or future discussion as it's a critical element of the trade space. It maybe the a one story boathouse at Site A is also a viable option if it doesn't encroach on the canal embankment or the Bike trail.

VR
Larry

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 229

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Eric M. Wind
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 344 Holly Oaks Ln
Camdenton, MO 65020
USA
E-mail: ericwind@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I believe that additional studies are unwarranted. We have already had 8 studies and 30 years of delays. It is shameful how others have intervened and played politics to prevent Georgetown University and The George Washington University from getting their own boathouses.

I think all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses are great. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and The George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 230

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Thomas Walsh
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Arlington, VA 22207
USA
E-mail:

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 232

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Edmond D. Villani
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Mamaroneck, NY 10543
USA
E-mail: ed.villani@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/23/2013 Date Received: 05/23/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Sirs:

As a member of the Georgetown University community for many years, and as a former rower, I strongly support designating the Non-motorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. I would be supportive of any of the sites (A,C,D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study. Let's get on with it. We have been studying it for over thirty years, and have done numerous environmental and feasibility studies. It is time to provide a safe and well conceived space for rowers on the Potomac.

Sincerely,
Edmond D Villani

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 233

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Caroline Labbe
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Falls Church, VA 22143
USA
E-mail: clabbe56@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear NPS,

Please consider the needs of car-top recreational users as you redevelop the national park lands along the Georgetown waterfront.

Kayakers, canoeists, and SUP users need a place where we can unload vehicles, prepare our watercraft, and launch our watercraft. A sandy beach would be ideal for launching. If that is not possible, then a low dock would work.

Car-top users also need access to parking. Water Street used to have 4-hour meters. A few years ago, they were changed to 2-hour meters. Paddlers often desire more than two hours on the water. Please bring back longer term parking meters on Water Street.

Car-top users also need facilities, at least port-a-potties. Rest rooms with running water, picnic tables, and grills would be nice for post-paddle picnics near the launch area. Bikers using the nearby trails could also use such an area.

Thank you for considering the needs of all waterfront users.

Sincerely,

Caroline Labbe

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 234**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization: Georgetown University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 308 Healy Hall
 Georgetown University
 Washington, DC 20057
 USA
E-mail: ssf2@georgetown.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013	Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Georgetown University
Comments on National Park Service
2013 Non-motorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study

Georgetown University is pleased to offer these comments on the Non-motorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study (Study) from the National Park Service (NPS). Georgetown is the oldest institution in the DC area that currently sponsors the sport of rowing. Recreational use of the river (boating and swimming) by Georgetown students has been a regular activity since the school's founding in 1789. In 1876, Georgetown students organized their first intercollegiate rowing team and built a boathouse on the riverbanks beneath the University in what is today the Non-motorized Boathouse Zone (NMBZ). In fact, the University has owned or leased several boathouses in the NMBZ since that time. As the longest continuous recreational user of the Potomac River, we welcome the continuing work of the NPS toward expanding rowing facilities on the Georgetown waterfront.

Since the National Park Service initially proposed the NMBZ more than twenty five years ago, the University has consistently been committed to developing a boathouse within the NMBZ in a reasonable and environmentally sensitive manner. We look forward to collaborating with NPS to develop greater access to the river for non-motorized boating in the immediate future.

BACKGROUND

The recently released Study references 1987 as the starting point for studies of this section of the Potomac waterfront. In fact, two years earlier, in 1985, the NPS conducted a study identifying "growing interest in non-motorized boating, particularly rowing, in the Washington D. C. metropolitan area" and acknowledging sufficient demand to sustain several additional boathouses along the Georgetown waterfront. In 1992, when the NPS proposed that the University consider constructing a boathouse in the area designated as Site A in the Study, we began working in good faith toward that end, including entering into a preliminary land exchange agreement for Site A in 1998. Based on that collaborative work and the land exchange agreement with the NPS, the University has invested significant resources in developing architectural plans, pursuing Zoning Commission, Old Georgetown Board, National Capital Planning Commission, and other local and federal approvals, and funding the 2006 Environmental Assessment for a boathouse on Site A.

Furthermore, the Study references the fact that the University owns a parcel of land within the C&O Canal National Historic Park about one mile upriver from the NMBZ as well as an easement to use the Capital Crescent Trail to access that property. However, the Study fails to point out the benefits of proceeding with that land transfer and extinguishing the easement which, in anticipation of the exchange, we have used very judiciously over the years. Likewise, the Study gives scant attention to the importance of freeing up space at Thompson's Boathouse that would result from permitting construction of university boathouses within the NMBZ. More than fifty percent of indoor storage space at Thompson's is consumed by university programs.

This background is important to provide context for our comments on this Study. Our commitment to develop a boathouse that will address NPS and community priorities, help expand rowing opportunities to populations who have not had access, and meet the needs of the University's men's and women's rowing programs remains steadfast. It is our intent to continue collaborative efforts through this process to finally fulfill that vision.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Study's Executive Summary rightly notes that ". . . there is likely not sufficient developable land within the non-motorized boathouse zone designated in the Georgetown Waterfront Park Master Plan to accommodate all user demand." In light of that stark reality, Development Scenario 1 ? High Density is the only scenario suggested that could reasonably be viewed as consistent with the long-established vision for the NMBZ, especially when factoring in the continuing growth in demand. To opt for either the Medium or Low Density Scenario would significantly limit the ability of the NPS to meet the demand for non-motorized boating facilities documented over nearly thirty years which was the premise behind the work of the last three decades.

Having said that and given the growing demand for rowing opportunities, we are concerned that this most recent Study minimizes the desirability of Site A as a location for the construction of a university rowing boathouse. Discounting that site unduly limits the ability to meet demand for rowing facilities. We are also concerned that there may be other agreements in effect that could limit flexibility with regard to the use of other proposed sites, thus diminishing options critical to achieving the goals of this process. On this point, we would also note that the Study references the demand for rowing storage and paddleboat storage in the same breath, as though the demand is equal. The record does not support this.

The Study mentions that the idea of moving the Washington Canoe Club to Site A was both supported and opposed in the public workshop. However, in light of the state of disrepair of the Washington Canoe Club facility which is, according to the Study, "not habitable by the club or others," we would echo the suggestion made by a representative of the National Trust for Historic Preservation that relocating and restoring that facility on Site A could protect the historic Washington Canoe Club while benefiting the overall development of the NMBZ. Such a move would ensure that the Washington Canoe Club remains adjacent to undeveloped terrain upriver and could encourage external support for stabilization and restoration work which is clearly needed. At the same time, this type of creative approach could result in a reconfigured site sufficient to accommodate a rowing boathouse -- utilizing Site B and a part of Site C without the constraints on design necessitated by required sewer line access.

The Study frequently refers to the desirability of preserving the natural and historic resources and cultural landscape of the waterfront, particularly west of the Aqueduct abutment. However, despite the Study's inclusion of photographs that depict the commercial and boathouse uses of that section of the riverfront, the Study fails to acknowledge that the University has owned or leased two boathouses west of the Aqueduct over the years. Furthermore, the Study excludes the Georgetown University buildings and the urban backdrop of the Rosslyn skyline, both of which are very much part of the landscape and cannot be ignored in assessing the urban to wilderness transition.

While the Study conceptualizes future boathouses as functional warehouse storage facilities for shells and boats and other related purposes, we believe that the planners of the Georgetown Waterfront Park and the National Capital Planning Commission had a much more holistic and aesthetic vision of the NMBZ and the shoreline when the NMBZ was conceived as an extension of the Waterfront Park.

In light of the historic use of the entire designated NMBZ for commercial and warehouse facilities consistent with the mercantile purposes that led to construction of the C&O Canal, construction of suitably designed boathouses similar to those along the Schuylkill River Boathouse Row in Philadelphia would be architecturally appealing and appropriate to the historic character of the area. Indeed, with some necessary modifications to more fully meet the growing

demand for non-motorized boating facilities, adopting the High Density Scenario could result in development that would remain consistent with the original intent of the NMBZ as well as bring the greatest benefits to the waterfront and to the community.

The Study lists "protection of threshold between urban and wilderness area" as one of the desired features for trail facilities. The C&O Canal Park (184-miles long) and the Capital Crescent trail (11 miles long) overlap and intersect with the NMBZ for approximately 1,100 feet of river frontage. Especially since preserving the natural scenic qualities of the Palisades was an original goal in setting NMBZ's upriver boundary and given the space constraints in the NMBZ, we believe that this transition from urban to wilderness does not need to occur entirely within the NMBZ.

The difficulty of parking in and around the NMBZ is properly identified in the Study; however, the Study does not adequately reflect the reality that university boathouses, which would be accessed in large part by students on foot or bicycle, are well suited to minimize parking needs.

Finally, we believe that all future boathouse facilities on the Georgetown waterfront ought to serve the greater community in different ways that fit with the mission of those operating them. Georgetown University is committed to guiding our students to be "women and men for others." This spirit is not only evidenced in extensive local, national, and international service engagements, but also by the work of our student-athletes with underprivileged youth in the DC area. It is our vision that a Georgetown University boathouse will provide important new opportunities for Georgetown rowers to help serve those with an interest in the river, especially among young people in the District of Columbia who have not had an opportunity previously to engage in rowing.

TECHNICAL COMMENTS

From a technical basis, the University is concerned that information included in the Study's Table 4 on Site Development Potential needs re-examination. The table indicates that the allowable FAR for Sites C, D and E is 1.8 FAR; however, the Zoning Regulations only allow 1.0 FAR for boathouses. Section 931.2 of the Zoning Regulations states: "In the W-1 District, the floor area ratio of all buildings and structures on a lot shall not exceed two and five-tenths (2.5), not more than one (1.0) of which may be used for other than residential purposes. The floor area ratio of public recreation and community centers shall not exceed 1.8."

Thus, 1.8 FAR would only be allowed for public recreation and community centers. The Zoning Regulations define public recreation and community center as: "An area, place structure, or other facility under the jurisdiction of a public agency that is used for community recreation activities." The type of boathouses envisioned for Sites C, D and E are boathouses to accommodate university and/or high school programs, and, thus, do not meet that definition. The change from 1.8 FAR to 1.0 FAR is significant in that it will result in a much smaller development potential for Sites C, D and E. The gross floor area numbers in Table 4 for Sites C, D and E will be reduced by almost half.

In addition to the reduced FAR allowed by right, there are already many other constraints on all five sites, including access issues, setbacks from the water, from the Key Bridge and Whitehurst Freeway, and from the Aqueduct and C&O Canal. Beyond that, parking, flood plain, utility, sewer and land ownership issues could significantly diminish the ability of a university or universities to put in place boathouses sufficient to meet the needs of already established rowing programs.

CONCLUSION

We reiterate our continued commitment to working collaboratively, both with the National Park Service and with others who have an interest in developing a workable plan for a well-designed NMBZ. To that end, it is critical that, following the May 22 public meeting, the National Park Service define a credible timetable for concluding the NMBZ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) without further delay. As the Study makes clear, nearly three decades have been consumed by successive studies. The public and various interested parties deserve to know that, at long last,

development can get underway. To avoid further delay, we would urge that the EIS be designed to avoid the necessity of subsequent site-specific Environmental Impact Statements. Site-specific design issues can, instead, be dealt with in the context of subsequent reviews and approvals required from the National Capital Planning Commission, the District of Columbia Zoning Commission, and the Old Georgetown Board.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 235**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Tyler J. Holt
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 102 Mooney Ct
Hampstead, NC 28443
USA
E-mail: tyler.holt317@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I was a rower at Georgetown from 1999-2003. I have spent the last ten years in the military. The lessons in teamwork and perseverance that I learned rowing on the Potomac River have been invaluable to me as I lead Marines in combat and training. I look forward to moving back to DC and resuming running and hiking along the river. Collegiate crew is part of the community of Georgetown and the Potomac River. The culture and experiences that scholastic and college rowers enjoy on the river are a vital part of the local community, and of the nation.

Three decades of study are more than enough to understand the situation. It is time to make a decision and move forward. Georgetown University's connection to the Potomac River shoreline has been established for over 100 years. Georgetown University and George Washington both have shoreline property that can be exchanged for designated boathouse sites within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

I believe all four sites, A, C, D, and E, work for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and designating sites for Georgetown University and GW University as soon as possible.

The beneficiaries of these boathouses are harder to see and to hear than the opposition. That's not because the rowing alumni are living all over the country and the world. That's because the real beneficiaries are not people, they are the larger Georgetown community and the nation.

Respectfully,

Tyler Holt

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 236**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Neil L. Lane
Organization: Georgetown Rowing Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1365 York Ave
Apt 16K
New York, NY 10021
USA
E-mail: nllane@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
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 the Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study. As a Washington D.C. resident between 1981 and 1989 and a former Georgetown rower and rowing coach I am acutely aware of the centrality of the Potomac River and its environs to the District and many of its citizens. When I arrived at Georgetown in 1981 I was struck by the beauty of the Potomac River and surprised by the fact that it was not host to a more vibrant rowing community such as exists in other great cities of the eastern seaboard such as Philadelphia and Boston. In fact, rowing aside, fewer citizens of the District appeared to visit the riverbank, take advantage of all it had to offer and appreciate its majesty than I would have expected and than I had seen in other cities around the world that are similarly blessed.

Rowers on the Potomac have been active and caring part of the River and of the community for well over a century. The rowing programs at Georgetown and at George Washington have reached out into the community and opened up the sport, and thus the River, to parts of the D.C., Maryland and Virginia community that never considered a day on the Potomac as a part of their lives, despite the fact that this jewel was so close to their front doors. Well designed and environmentally thoughtful boathouses on the designated sites would add to, not detract from, the natural beauty of the shoreline and, as importantly, expand that outreach into the surrounding communities. To deny such access based upon the complaints of a privileged but vocal chorus strikes me as shockingly undemocratic in a city such as Washington D.C.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline

date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Neil Lawrence Lane
Georgetown University 1985; Georgetown Law 1989
President
Georgetown Rowing Association

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 237**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert E. Crowley
Organization: Georgetown Alumnus
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kennebunk, ME 04043
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

After all these years, it is time to move forward. I support the designation of site for Georgetown and George Washington in the Non Motorized Boat Zone.

Robert E. Crowley

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 238**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: William Holdsworth
Organization: C&O Canal Association

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 10 Radburn Court
Rockville, MD 20850
USA
E-mail: w.holdsworth@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The low density options is the best among those offered in the feasibility study. For me, two principles are at work:

- 1) We need to avoid construction of facilities on Sites A, B & C which will generate traffic and inhibit people's enjoyment of the Capital Crescent Trail and the C&O Canal towpath.
- 2) No private development should occur within the C&O Canal National Historical Park.

I have no objections to the Medium Density or High Density plans for Sites D & E.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 239

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Nathaniel A. Day
Organization: Washington Canoe Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1815 A St SE
Apt 101
Washington, DC 20003
USA
E-mail: nathan.a.day@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a nonmotorized boating enthusiast, lover of the local natural environment, and captain of a program that is always seeking new paddlers and people interested in getting on the water, it is wonderful to see the Park Service proposing ways to help more people take advantage of the tremendous recreational, competitive, and natural resource that is the Potomac River here in DC. It is great to see that all three scenarios involve what seems to be a public-use building on the vacant, concrete-paved, and ugly lot between Key Bridge and the west end of Georgetown Waterfront Park. My enthusiasm is not dimmed by the following concerns about these plans:

First, to undertake planning for the NMBZ without coordinated planning for Rock Creek Park, Thompson Boathouse, and the Arlington, VA shore of the river seems almost literally narrow-minded. How can invested stakeholders, including the NPS, determine what plan is best to meet the demand for nonmotorized access to the river while only considering a small portion of the waterfront and agencies involved?

Second, the plans need to better account for the transit needs of those who would use the facilities proposed, especially in the high-density scenario. Given that people are currently parking (illegally) on the grass lot next to the Aqueduct that would become a building in this scenario, the number of effective parking spaces in the area would effectively be decreased in this scenario, while the demand for usage and parking would increase -- yet the the illegal parking currently happening in this lot shows that there is already insufficient parking to meet current needs. Public parking spots on K/Water Street are consistently stuffed, and the 2-hour city meters do not allow for the length of time that many people spend on the water at a stretch. Even if a person can find a parking spot, and can return from the water to feed a meter over a long excursion or workout, these parking spaces are nearly a quarter mile or more from all but Site E. As an environmentalist, I believe in the use of mass transit, but mass transit options in this area of Georgetown are, to put it bluntly, terrible. The closest Metro stop is Rosslyn, across the river in VA (and a 15-20 min. walk from the NMBZ that involves at least one flight of stairs to cross the C+O canal); the next closest is Foggy Bottom, a longer and uglier walk away that involves crossing the pedestrian-unfriendly intersection of the Whitehurst freeway with K and Rock Creek Parkway; the two buses that come close to this area (intersection of Wisconsin and K/Water) are the D5/6 and Circulator, both of which are locals that run very slowly through crowded streets in the after-work hours when the facilities proposed would see most of their weekday use. The high-density scenario, in other words, provides access to the water, but no way to take advantage of this access for people who do not live within walking distance of the NMBZ, because public transit in this area is so poor. As an aside, it was surprising and disappointing to learn at the open house that Park Service officials were not already aware of these facts.

As a person who values the isolation and near-wilderness that the river upstream of the NMBZ currently offers, the development of Site A -- even as a car-top beach launch -- is discouraging. Sites D and E are already either already utilized or under-developed; focusing development on these sites, converting site C into parking with car-top launching, and leaving Site A undeveloped would seem to provide the greatest access to the greatest number of people while not disturbing or destroying "wild" parkland. If there is a car-top launch at a Site C parking lot, why would a further launch site need to be constructed at Site A, where pass-through foot traffic would disturb operations at the Washington Canoe Club (the concrete apron is used as a social space, as well as a mustering area for practice and boat loading and unloading from vehicles), and which would require the development of currently undeveloped parkland?

I submit that the development of car-top launching at a Site C parking lot, with intensive development of sites D and E, would maximize both people's access to the river and their ability to make use of that access, while preserving currently undeveloped land.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 240

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: K Posner
Organization: Georgetown University Alumna
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I feel that all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study are suited for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted. As a former Georgetown rower, I feel this is something that would not only benefit the univeristy but also the community.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024 Correspondence: 241

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Neal T. Fitzpatrick
Organization: Audubon Naturalist Society
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8940 Jones Mill Road
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
USA
E-mail: neal@audubonnaturalist.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Audubon Naturalist Society (ANS) uses the C & O Canal National Historical Park as a classroom for our environmental education programs.

ANS is a member of the Defenders of the Potomac River Parkland coalition. We completely support their statement on the Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.

Neal Fitzpatrick
Executive Director

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 242

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: James G. Titus
Organization: Maryland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6718 Glenn Dale Rd
 Glenn Dale, MD 20769
 USA
E-mail: jtitus@risingsea.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

If I correctly understand the purpose for which you are seeking public input, NPS is asking for comments on the feasibility study, but not for public comments on the ultimate decision that NPS will eventually make on this waterfront zoning. So I'll limit myself to deficiencies that I noticed in the study, which should be corrected before this study is used as a basis for a formal alternatives analysis.

1. The specification of the three choices is seriously flawed, because the "medium" option is much more similar to the high-density than the low-density option. The most fundamental question on which the three options differ, is the extent to which a pristine riverfront will be replaced with boathouses-possibly private boat houses.

a. The high scenario is reasonable: All Five sites.
b. The low scenario is reasonable: only develop the site farthest away (site A) while leaving B and D as-is.
c. The obvious middle ground would be to develop sites A and C, while leaving B and D as-is, while leaving E pristine. Perhaps one might intensely develop site D. That would represent the normal expectation of a middle ground, in that the patchwork of boat houses and undeveloped lands becomes more intensely developed, while the boundary of pristine lands remains the same.
Thus the medium-density option would be more properly labeled as the "sprawl option": One could just as easily get the same level of development by infilling the portion that is already developed, but instead NPS would place a structure in the pristine area.
The fact that NPS would develop site E before having intensely developed B and C suggests that NPS is less interested in preserving the environment and serving the public, than providing a development site convenient to Georgetown University. The feasibility study should forthrightly state that serving Georgetown University is the primary objective of the medium density scenario having been specified so as to develop site E rather than C.
2. The feasibility study should more clearly explain the implications of developing sites D and E on the layout and use of the Capital Crescent Trail. Too little detail is provided for one to understand the ramifications of either.
3. The scenarios should not merely provide a final footprint, but should also consider the timing. In particular, one would assume that sites D and especially E are the most problematic as far as public amenities are concerned. Therefore, the feasibility study should consider a staging which re-develops sites A, B, and C first, before deciding whether that is enough, or whether D should also be developed.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 243**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: James G. Titus
Organization: Maryland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6718 Glenn Dale Rd
Glenn Dale, MD 20769
USA
E-mail: jtitus@risingsea.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

<p>If I correctly understand the purpose for which you are seeking public input, NPS is asking for comments on the feasibility study, but not for public comments on the ultimate decision that NPS will eventually make on this waterfront zoning. So I'll limit myself to deficiencies that I noticed in the study, which should be corrected before this study is used as a basis for a formal alternatives analysis.

1. The specification of the three choices is seriously flawed, because the "medium" option is much more similar to the high-density than the low-density option. The most fundamental question on which the three options differ, is the extent to which a pristine riverfront will be replaced with boathouses-possibly private boat houses.

a. The high scenario is reasonable: All Five sites.

b. The low scenario is reasonable: only develop the site farthest away (site A) while leaving B and D as-is.

c. The obvious middle ground would be to develop sites A and C, while leaving B and D as-is, while leaving E pristine. Perhaps one might intensely develop site

d. That would represent the normal expectation of a middle ground, in that the patchwork of boat houses and undeveloped lands becomes more intensely developed, while the boundary of pristine lands remains the same.

Thus the medium-density option would be more properly labeled as the "sprawl option": One could just as easily get the same level of development by infilling the portion that is already developed, but instead NPS would place a structure in the pristine area.

The fact that NPS would develop site E before having intensely developed B and C suggests that NPS is less interested in preserving the environment and serving the public, than providing a development site convenient to Georgetown University. The feasibility study should forthrightly state that serving Georgetown University is the primary objective of the medium density scenario having been specified so as to develop site E rather than C.</p><p>

2. The feasibility study should more clearly explain the implications of developing sites D and E on the layout and use of the Capital Crescent Trail. Too little detail is provided for one to understand the ramifications of either.</p><p>

3. The scenarios should not merely provide a final footprint, but should also consider the timing. In particular, one would assume that sites D and especially E are the most problematic as far as public amenities are concerned.

Therefore, the feasibility study should consider a staging which re-develops sites A, B, and C first, before deciding whether that is enough, or whether D should also be developed.

</p>

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024 Correspondence: 244

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: JOnda McFarlane
Organization: FOGWP
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington, DC 20037
USA
E-mail: jonda3131@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I attended the open house on May 22. I prefer the highest density approach, as the need is great. While parking would be nice, more important would be a loading/off-loading area from the road, especially for those whose boats are not stored at one of the facilities (such as regatta participants). Really good to see a kayak/paddling etc facility - better for both shell-users and kayakers, etc. Also, having a separate facility for them would mean that they could operate out of Thompson's as the other boathouses are built, and then move into their facility when Thompson's new life begins.

In that regard, I believe that NPS should include in its RFP for Thompson's a requirement that the new operator remodel or - preferably - tear it down and create a new facility that would be up to the standards of the rest of the Georgetown waterfront. Naturally, including such a requirement would necessitate a more generous contract for the new operator, but would be worth it for the resulting enhanced experience for the long-suffering boating community. Public/private partnerships have been well-tested and extremely successful. The public is more than willing to help financially on these projects; the Park Service should not hold boating enthusiasts hostage to an interminable process.

SO! - let's get on with it! This whole process has been excruciatingly slow. There is huge demand for non-motorized boating in the Washington area. The time for study is over; I hope that NPS will put this decision on a "fast-track" basis.

Thank you.
Jonda McFarlane

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 245**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Richard Banchoff
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22304
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I applaud all the effort by the NPS that went into the Feasibility Study, and I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to approve sites for Georgetown University and George

Washington University. I have lived in the area since I came to Georgetown University in 1964. Despite the negative characterization of the University in some of the other comments, I know that Georgetown rowing has benefited many thousands of rowers over the years and that the rowing team has always been a positive influence in an area along the Potomac that for decades was seriously neglected. I am also the father of a rower at the premier rowing high school in the area, TC Williams, and have seen first hand how the presence of private boat clubs in Philadelphia and Boston add to both the scenic and cultural resources of those cities. I am persuaded by the insightful comments from the Yorktown High School crew parents and coaches that the approval of the Georgetown and GW boathouses will greatly increase the availability of safe and accessible rowing facilities for local high school rowers and provide a more appealing venue for races. If you want to see first hand how the presence of rowing facilities benefits the residents of the area, stand along the shoreline with hundreds of others in Georgetown or by the Kennedy Center on some weekend and watch the high school and college races in Spring and Head of the Potomac in the Fall. The time for analysis is over. Let's get this done.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 246**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Erik Kramer
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail: kramerer1@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I spent the year of 2012 studying this section of the potomac in an attempt to design a public feature that would include a boathouse. Siting was as much a struggle for me as it seems to be for the Georgetown guys. After a few months of trying to place a building on land, I came across the idea of using the extant aqueduct bridge structure to build a number of piers that would house different programs: cafe, swimming hole, mooring, boathouse, to name a few. And it would do it all while providing bikers and hikers a connection across the potomac, and the city of washington a connection to the water. Maybe you guys should take a look at it, as it contains forward-looking solutions to this problems, as well as a great gesture towards the public and nature.

The abridged sheet is here:
http://ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis.jpg

The full thesis is here:

http://ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis_h2odc.pdf

Hope it can spark some conversation!

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 247**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Casey J. Zilinek
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Oakland , CA 94606
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I visited the site of my friend Erik's water project in 2011 and was impressed with the idea. Maybe a little more than what you are trying to do, but worth a look.

The abridged sheet is here:

http://ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis.jpg

The full thesis is here:

http://ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis_h2odc.pdf

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 248

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Frederick J. King Jr.
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 829 Baronne Street
Suite 200
New Orleans, LA 70113
USA
E-mail: fking@frederickjking.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

My name is Fred King. I am an alumnus of Georgetown University, class of 1966.

I am comfortable with sites A, C, D and E indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses.

I fully support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as speedily as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and GWU. Both universities have extremely valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls with the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. There have been 8 studies and a 30 year delay.

More delay is inexcusable.

I have appreciated Georgetown University's rowing tradition on the Potomac River and her banks dating back into the 1800's. My ancestor was actually Georgetown's founder. I began my own rowing career there in 1962 and still row and compete today with the New Orleans Rowing Club. Just as Georgetown has produced National, Olympic and World Rowing Championships, many of our former rowers have gone on to coach all over the U.S. and we ourselves have produced such champions. I want to see this program continue.

Thank you,
Fred King

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 249

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Andy Stephens
Organization: Washington Kayak Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Falls Church, VA 22042
USA
E-mail: andy.stephens@stanfordalumni.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

On behalf of the Washington Kayak Club's 500 members, I can say that paddlers don't need a dock or any other expensive facilities. All that paddlers need is PB&J -- and, like the sandwich, it's simple: Parking; a Beach, or access to the Bank; and a John.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 250**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Christopher J. Mathieu
Organization: Georgetown University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 800 Connecticut Ave NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20006
USA
E-mail: mathieu.cj@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have been involved/following the boathouse saga since 2004. I attended many meetings as a member of Georgetown's crew team and have remained involved since my return to Washington DC in 2011. It is disappointing that after more than 30 years and 8 prior feasibility studies, a resolution that grants Georgetown and GW land for a boathouse has not been reached. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate these sites.

-CJ

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 251

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Carly McCaffrey
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington, DC 20057
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 252

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address: Washington, DC 20007
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 253

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Michael La Place
Organization: Alumnus, The George Washington University
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2121 Eye Street, NW, Rice Hall
Washington, DC 20052
Westfield, NJ 07090
USA
E-mail: mjlaplace@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Thank you for this opportunity to express my support for the the development of a Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone along the Potomac River, west of the new Georgetown Waterfront Park. Due to the high and growing demand for recreational access to the waterfront, as well as the overcrowded conditions at Thompson Boat Center and the very long wait by area universities for individual collegiate boathouses, I strongly support the HIGH DENSITY proposal. As part of the High Density Development, I want to state my strong support for the development of a collegiate boathouse for the use of the George Washington University (GW) at what is identified in National Park Service studies as Site E, immediately west of the Georgetown Waterfront Park and east of Key Bridge. As stated in many previous studies and reports such as the January 25, 2007 NCPC Staff Report, Site E has long been promised to the George Washington University and GW deserves to have this site for development of a boathouse for use by the university's rowing and sailing programs. The complications associated with determining the location of a boathouse for neighboring Georgetown University (GU) should in no way delay or impact the approval of GW's boathouse facility at Site E. It is important to note that Site E is the location closest to GW's main campus in Foggy Bottom. The proximity of Site E to the Waterfront Park and Washington Harbour will be very advantageous to GW as it hosts the popular George Washington Invitational rowing competition each year. I also support the use of a site in the proposed boathouse zone for use by Georgetown University for a collegiate boathouse. Site A or one of the locations west of Key Bridge would be close to the Georgetown campus and therefore make the most sense for that university. I have no problem with the two universities making their boathouses available for use by the public and high school rowing and sailing teams. Again, I urge the National Park Service to approve the HIGH DENSITY proposal for boathouse development, with separate facilities serving George Washington and Georgetown universities. Thank you.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 254

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Jerilyn M. Levi
Organization: Rock Creek Rowing
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 220 North Liberty Street, Arlington, VA 22203
Arlington, VA 22203
USA
E-mail: jlevi220@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a Masters rower, skuller, and parent of a Washington Lee High School rower, I appreciate all of the work to date. One major concern is the apparent lack of coordination with the Arlington County and Vicinity Non-Motorized Boathouse Facility EIS
<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=186&projectID=13418&documentID=48320>. Facility development

on the Georgetown Waterfront should be closely coordinated with NPS proposals for the Virginia side even if (2) administrative units of the NPS are separately doing assessment work. It is critical to assess the impact of new river access and facility development and use on the Virginia side of the Upper Potomac in conjunction with actions to be taken on the opposite side of the river, especially because there is strong interest in construction of facilities in Rosslyn across from Roosevelt Island. The alternatives described do not address this. Another significant concern is the need to rehabilitate and update facilities at Thompson's Boathouse, which is also not addressed in the EIS but relevant to use of the Upper Potomac River. Thompson Boathouse should be a showcase for the Nation's Capitol, with heat and running water year-round and public access for a wide range of users including the handicapped. Capital investments/improvements of all sites should address year round use, solar power as well as LEED certification at all facilities. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 255**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Gregory A. Love
Organization: Potomac Boat Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4138 26th Rd N
Arlington, VA
Arlington, VA 22207
USA
E-mail: greglove88@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I wholeheartedly support the development of NMB facilities in the areas identified in the Feasibility Study. Limiting access to the river is not a viable option to promote the non-motorized use of the river. The development of one or more of the identified sites should permit public access and promote programs designed to teach boating skills, water safety and enable further opportunities to pursue recreational and competitive boating activities.

The evaluation of the proposed NMBZ should consider address options to ease congestion at Thompson Boat Center. One or more of the proposed sites should consider a facility to promote water sports modeled after the mission of the Community Rowing Inc. located in the greater Cambridge, MA area.

In addition to the five sites identified in the Feasibility Study, I support the consideration of a future Arlington Boathouse on the river's Virginia side. The feasibility study conducted in 2002 resulted in a decision by NPS to carry

that study forward as an environmental impact statement (EIS). It is recommended that that the Arlington Boathouse EIS could be evaluated in conjunction with a decision to proceed with an EIS of the site options identified in the current Feasibility Study (Sites A, B, C, D and E).

I commend the NPS for their diligence to complete the Feasibility Study and look forward to further progress leading to the development of additional boathouses and other types of NMB access to the river.

Thank you,

Gregory Love

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 256**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Eric J. Bruyette
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Annandale, VA 22003
USA
E-mail: ericbruyette35@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Here is a great link to a thesis project that could be great for this area:

Abridged Version:
http://ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis.jpg

Full Thesis:
http://ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis_h2odc.pdf

Best,
Eric Bruyette

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 257

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Nick Dzienny
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, CA 22304
USA
E-mail: nicklaus.dzienny@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

A friend of a friend recently passed on a graduate student thesis project to bring water culture to DC. I was super impressed by the project and think it could provide not only a boat house, but create a thriving community and culture around the Potomac. It felt fitting and worth mentioning as you begin your feasibility testing. Below is a link to the thesis project title H20DC.

http://ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis.jpg

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 258

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Richard J. McCooey
Organization: Georgetown University Class of 1952
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
5529 30th Street NW
Washington, DC 20015
Washington , DC 20015
USA
E-mail: Persona789@aol.com

Correspondence Information

The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

As an alum of Georgetown University, 4-year varsity rower, and former captain of the lightweight women's program, I understand the cultural power of Georgetown's rowing program, its dedication to the Potomac community, and its need for its own boathouse. The student-athletes dedicate so much of their time, energy, and spirit to rowing and to the University. They have reached great results, despite not having a boathouse comparable to other top programs. The plans for a new boathouse would bring the program to the next level and allow the dedicated student-athletes to fully realize their potential.

The Potomac community would benefit as well. Being a Philadelphia native, I grew up surrounded by the beauty of boathouse row. With the addition of a Georgetown boathouse, the Georgetown waterfront could enhance its appeal, allowing rowers and non-rowers to enjoy the water, trails, and views.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024 Correspondence: 260

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Ron Tripp
Organization: Coalition For the Capital Crescent Trail
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington, DC 20012
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

These comments are submitted on behalf of the Board of the Coalition For the Capital Crescent Trail (CCCT), our 2500 members, and many thousands of Capital Crescent Trail (CCT) users to express our thoughts on the Georgetown Waterfront Park Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone Draft Feasibility Study, released on April 20, 2013. The CCCT appreciates your consideration of our concerns as you move forward toward the final version of the Feasibility Study. It is the CCCT's understanding that the Feasibility Study will provide guidelines for devising a coherent and viable development plan for boating & boathouses along the Georgetown Waterfront between 34th & Water Streets NW and a point approximately 1100' upriver from the Key Bridge. Without question, one of the most significant challenges in developing boating opportunities in the section of the proposed Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone (NMBZ) upriver from the Aqueduct Bridge is the impact of those developments on the heavily used Capital Crescent

Trail (CCT). As the Feasibility Study notes, a Trail Use Survey was conducted in 2006, which determined that there were approximately a million annual user visits to the CCT in the study area, and that number has grown in the years since the survey was completed. This level of trail usage, combined with the narrow width of the NMBZ, the natural setting upriver from the end of Water Street, and space limitations for diverse user groups passing through the arch of the Aqueduct Bridge, create serious challenges for any study attempting to discern appropriate boating/boathouse usage.

We support many of the concepts developed in the Draft Feasibility Study, but we have reservations concerning some of the proposals put forth in the three scenarios presented in the document. We like the idea of separating rowing and paddling facilities at the Aqueduct Bridge, as presented in the Low & Medium Density scenarios, with rowing facilities located downstream along Water Street, and paddling facilities located upstream along the CCT. Given that the CCT is a component of the C&O Canal National Historical Park (C&O NHP), the approach of locating private facilities, such as university boathouses, outside the park, is to be applauded. As we have said many times, any development along the CCT should be for the benefit of the public, and must be mindful of negative impacts on trail users. We were also happy to see that the scenarios which called for a building on Site A recognized that it should be scaled back quite a bit from what had previously been suggested for that site. The reduction from a building with a footprint of 18,000+ sq. ft. to one with less than 8,000 sq. ft., and similar in scale to the existing Washington Canoe Club (WCC) building, is consistent with our view of what that site could physically accommodate. Of course, the details of how such a facility would be used are critical in determining impacts on trail users, so we cannot possibly indicate approval of such a building without the particulars that would accompany a detailed proposal. In the High Density scenario, the scale of the building on Site C seems much too large for that site. The "shadow" footprint is in excess of 13,000 sq. ft., and, at the suggested three stories in height, its total square footage comes in at approximately 40,000 sq. ft. Further, its designation as a rowing facility in the High Density scenario makes the separation of rowing & paddling activities less clear cut. In the High & Medium Density scenarios, the use of Sites D & E for university or high school rowing facilities appears appropriate. Their location on Water Street, along with the urban and industrial character of this section of the NMBZ, make them a better fit for the larger, more intensely developed boathouses required by such programs.

Unfortunately, all the good suggestions made in the study could be undone by one significant flaw ? in the Medium & Low Density scenarios, vehicular traffic is allowed, and possibly encouraged, from the end of Water Street, through the Aqueduct Arch, and into the C&O NHP. In the High Density scenario the study suggests that space constraints preclude on-site parking, but it does not address how paddle craft operating out of Site A, or rowing/paddle craft out of Site C, will get from the end of Water Street to those two sites. In the Findings section of the Executive Summary, the study notes, "People recognize a need to address circulation and transitions between Capital Crescent Trail and Water Street, NW and to consider how the many users in the non-motorized boathouse zone would interact." Absent a detailed plan of how such traffic would be managed, it is our opinion that increasing vehicle usage beyond the western end of Water Street will only move the circulation and transition issues from the street and into the C&O NHP. Of course, any development plan allowing vehicles west of Water Street will have to protect the safety of trail users, which includes both separation from vehicles, and maintaining the usable trail width of 10' pavement, with 2' soft shoulders on either side. In addition, any vehicular access and parking west of the terminus of Water Street must be tightly managed. The current illegal parking situation on Site C is an illustration of what will happen if strict rules are not enforced for vehicles entering the C&O NHP. We note that there are two existing boating facilities on the Potomac River in the vicinity of the proposed NMBZ ? Thompson's Boat Center, and Fletcher's Boathouse ? which have large parking lots, and allow public launching of various non-motorized watercraft, so why not keep all motorized vehicles ? watercraft & automobiles ? out of the C&O NHP? Any public boathouses sited inside the C&O NHP could be for individuals renting long-term storage space for their boats, or for daily rental of boats to the public, who could walk or bike from available public parking in Georgetown to the NMBZ sites.

Finally, we would like some clarification of the following line found in the Conclusion section of the study, particularly

the portion we have italicized:

"The scenarios represent generalized approaches to siting facilities within the zone from high density to low density; smaller facilities or a facility with a different purpose could also be developed..."

Does that mean, for example, that the recommended use for Site A in the High & Medium Density Scenarios for paddlecraft could be changed in a future development plan to a university rowing facility? Please explain what you mean by "different purpose".

We look forward to working with you to achieve the best possible outcome for trail users and boating advocates within the NMBZ.

Sincerely,

Ron Tripp
Chairman, Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail
contact@cctrail.org

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 261**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: PKS Weber Hawkins
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington, DC 20007
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support a) designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and b) proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.

Both of these universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

Georgetown University has deep roots in the community, with a rowing tradition dating back to the 1800s. As a good neighbor the University has worked with NPS and other stakeholders to seek a solution that benefits everyone who uses the area's resources-resident & visitor alike, including the ever increasing number of area high school rowing programs.

As one of those long-time heavy users of these river and shoreline resources (60+ years) and a neighbor (40+ year resident of the east end of the Palisades) in my opinion building these boathouses in the designated boathouse zone can only enhance the Potomac River waterfront in Georgetown, will not impinge on usability of the area for others, will make space for some of our area high school programs (some of which have had former Georgetown crew as coaches), and as mentioned provide NPS other desirable shoreline property in exchange.

A life-long resident of DC, I have always taken advantage of what DC has to offer in all its guises. In particular I love DC's natural resources and am drawn to our rivers, and the hiking, biking & boating opportunities along the shoreline and the Canal. We raised our children to have the respect and love for the same things and they in turn are passing that along to their children. We as a family are good stewards of the river and keenly aware of how fortunate we have been and continue to be to have this jewel nearby.

I would love to see the Georgetown (and the GW) Boathouse(s) finally built. I can support all of the sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. After 30 years and 8 prior studies, to spend additional time and money on more study would I believe be unwarranted.

I welcome the university boathouses and the rowers along my river and know that they too will be good neighbors and good stewards.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 262**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Gretchen Ellsworth
Organization: Potomac Boat Club, Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1852 Columbia Rd, NW #602
Washington, DC 20009
USA
E-mail: gretchene@mindspring.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

My name is Gretchen Ellsworth. I have been a rower for twenty years on the Potomac, before that I directed high school regattas in the Washington DC area for five years and led my high school's crew boosters for several years. Throughout that time I have seen the expansion in popularity of rowing as a sport from high school students through septuagenarians.

I have also am a founding member of the board of directors of the Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park, which has supported the role of rowing and paddling on the waterfront steadfastly since its inception

The most obvious point , not highlighted by the report, is that sports that are conducted on the water intrinsically need direct access to the water from the adjacent shoreline. This is not true of other sports and recreation which may well value the river, as they should, for esthetic and contemplative purposes Rowers do not wish to dominate the shoreline, but we do strongly observe the need for several more points of access, with the storage and program facilities to make that possible.

I think our goal should be access to the river, which Philadelphia's Schuylkill and Boston's Charles encourage over the look-but-don't?touch lack of access to the Hudson and East Rivers surrounding Manhattan.

In addition, the report alleges that the Site A is an environmentally sensitive area, which the facts do not seem to support. Further, NPS officials have told me that here are people/groups who strongly want to maintain the shoreline west of the Aqueduct Bridge as a kind of "rural" or "unspoiled" area. For this to happen the Washington Canoe Club would have to be removed. Yet everyone, myself included, wants that historic structure to stay. I would submit that the "urban" area begins well before the Aqueduct Bridge, and that a transition zone from wide open Capital Crescent Trail to shared areas of parking, pedestrian and motor vehicles is much needed for safety. There is room on Site A for a university boathouse, with its access to trailers across a right of way passing in front of the

There is a great need to reach compromises, to improve a number of unkempt and unsightly stretches of the waterfront and find ways to accommodate the many different users of the lands adjacent to the waterfront.

Gretchen Ellsworth

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 263**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Whit Fosburgh
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4887 MacArthur Blvd., NW
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail: wfosburgh@trcp.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a Washington, DC resident living in the Palisades, I have been rowing on the Potomac River for more than 30 years. I strongly support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. All sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses are appropriate sites.

The single biggest limitation to recreational enjoyment of the Potomac is boathouse space. Thompson's Boat Center now resembles a South African shanty town, with sprawling metal fences protecting open air racks, where boats (and athletes) are subject to extreme conditions and vandalism. The boat ramps are so crowded in the morning and afternoon that it's a hindrance all recreational users who must use the docks.

Georgetown University has sponsored rowing teams on Potomac River shoreline since the late 1800s, and for the last 30 years has been working patiently with the National Park Service and the city to build its own boathouse. Georgetown has participated in eight prior boathouse studies and dutifully following the NPS rules and guidelines, only to see those rules and guidelines constantly change.

Georgetown, like George Washington, has valuable Potomac River shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. It is time for the Park Service to stop dithering and to expedite the development of the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone so that all rowers and paddlers can access and enjoy the Potomac River.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 264

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Mark M. White

Organization:

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

Washington, DC 20003
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I think a great option for this project is the H2ODC plan. This project would be a great way for the public to utilize the water in that area of Georgetown and bring together many times of water sports/activities. Also, by using an existing structure it could be a more cost effective option as well. Creating a cutting edge structure like this could boost the surrounding economy also. A link to the project is below.

http://ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis.jpg

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 265

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: doug brooks
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 401 holland ln
811
Alexandria , VA 22314
USA
E-mail: douglasjbrooks@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I recall a thesis project by a Virginia Tech student who proposed this solution:

http://ricodsgn.com/images/thesis/erikkramer_thesis_h2odc.pdf

Best,

Doug Brooks

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 266

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Martin G. Mikelsons

Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1617 N Artesian Ave Unit 1S
Chicago, IL 60647
USA
E-mail: geoff.mikelsons@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. Both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. More study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 267

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mark Pisano
Organization: University of Southern California, Price School of Public Policy
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4200 Dundee Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90027
USA
E-mail: map3@me.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To whom it may concern

I am Mark Pisano a graduate of Georgetown University '64 and a Georgetown Oarsman for three years. I currently am a Senior Fellow at the Price School of Policy at the University of Southern California. I also am Cochairman of the Federal Systems Panel of the National Academy of Public Administration. I previously directed the Southern California Association of Governments, the MPO and COG for Southern California for over three decades.

I have review the Non Motorized Boathouse Zone and its appendices and thank you for the opportunity to comment on the documents. It is clear from these documents and the related references that a great deal of time and resources have been committed to this project over many years. The NMBZ clearly concludes that there are multiple sites that could be used to meet the growing demand for non motorized recreational use. From this array of sites an operative strategy can be developed. The report also summarizes the competing demands and uses that need to be balanced along the front. The report also notes the limitations of environment and historic preservation that must be considered. The report also identifies the next steps that need to be taken to bring forth a solution to a beneficial use of the zone. This body of work is important in moving to the next steps.

What is missing from the report is compilation of the possible resources and organizations that could be brought into the decision-making process to accelerate moving the initiative forward. There are two Universities Georgetown and George Washington that have property and financial resources that could be part of strategy development and decision making. There are other business and government interests that could also become part of the solution. If these resources and capabilities are not identified up front, the next steps that are suggested in the report would contribute to continuing cycles of Master Planning and specific plan modifications all requiring fiscal demands on the National Park Service. In my role of cochair of the Federal System Panel of NAPA, we have been looking at the fiscal stress of the Federal Governmental system and know that the fiscal stress on all governmental systems is great and getting more serious and will continue for a long time. New ways need to be explored to make the planning and decision making of agencies more efficient.

Numerous models and prototypes of finding solutions to integrated solutions of parks, recreation, preservation and education have been undertaken in many agencies including the NPS. Many of these examples have been brought forward to Federal System Panel. These partnership approaches could be utilized in the Zone. I would hope that these resources and approaches are included in the next steps that are taken. I encourage the NPS to proceed in this fashion. It will make the next steps more efficient; it will reduce demands on the scarce resources of the NPS; and most importantly it will yield better decision making and results for the public.

I hope these comments will assist the NPS in moving this initiative forward and am willing to assist in anyway possible.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Mark Pisano
Senior Fellow
Price School of Public Policy
University of Southern California
mpisano@usc.edu
213-422-3303

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 268**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Will Packard
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: will@cdginteractive.com
Arlington, VA 22205
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have been rowing on the Potomac River for 34 years. Since I started the sport has boomed in popularity, and now includes participants of all ages, and from many schools and colleges. The facilities have not kept pace with demand.

I strongly support the development of additional non-motorized rowing and paddling facilities on the upper Potomac along the Georgetown waterfront. In particular, I urge the NPS to move forward with permitting Georgetown University to build a boathouse on Site A.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024 Correspondence: 269

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Vincent J. Convery
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: McLean, VA 22101
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a longtime Washington area resident, I have used - and am grateful for - the recreational facilities available here. I support the creation of the Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and permitting area universities to establish boathouses there. This would benefit not only the participating athletes but also the numerous members of the general public who could enjoy a beautiful day on the river taking in the competition.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 270

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Robert L. Palmer

Organization:

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
USA

E-mail: Rlp378@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. I went to and rowed for Georgetown and frequently visit. I am a great fan of the canal and use it whenever I can when in the area. Non-motorized use (and areas) of the Potomac River are highly desirable and should be encouraged. All of the sites indicated in the feasibility study (A, C, D, E) have aspects to recommend them. Many of the disapproving comments are objections to allowing "private" development on NPS land. This is short-sighted. The roots of Georgetown University on Georgetown's Potomac River shoreline date back well into the 19th century. It is my understanding that both universities have valuable Potomac shoreline property to exchange for designated boathouse sites on frontage that the National Park Service controls within the designated Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 271

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: David Rycyna
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1683 Union St.
San Francisco, CA 94123
USA
E-mail: drycyna@cirrusled.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

It is tragic that the park service has denied the people of Washington DC this beautiful and long over-due boathouse for so long. The Georgetown and GW communities have shaped the surrounding areas since their founding for the better. In the case of Georgetown, that was nearly 150 years prior to the founding of the National Parks Service itself. A boathouse once sat not far from the proposed sites. This is a project that will enrich the area, make the waterfront more accessible, safe, and enjoyable for everyone in the community.

I fully support all of the locations (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses.

I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 272

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: James G. Titus
Organization: Maryland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6718 Glenn Dale Rd
Glenn Dale , MD 20769
USA
E-mail: jtitus@risingsea.net

Correspondence Information

Keep Private: No
Name: James G. Titus
Organization: Maryland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6718 Glenn Dale Rd
Glenn Dale , MD 20769
USA
E-mail: jtitus@risingsea.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

(This version corrects editorial errors in my previous submission)

<p>If I correctly understand the purpose for which you are seeking public input, NPS is asking for comments on the feasibility study, but not for public comments on the ultimate decision that NPS will eventually make on this waterfront zoning. So I'll limit myself to deficiencies that I noticed in the study, which should be corrected before this study is used as a basis for a formal alternatives analysis.</p><p>

1. The specification of the three choices is seriously flawed, because the "medium" option is much more similar to the high-density than the low-density option. The most fundamental question on which the three options differ, is the extent to which a pristine riverfront will be replaced with boathouses-possibly private boat houses.

a. The high scenario is reasonable: All Five sites.

b. The low scenario is reasonable: only develop the site farthest away (site E) while leaving B and D as-is.

c. The obvious middle ground would be to develop sites E and C, while leaving B and D as-is, while leaving A pristine. Perhaps one might intensely develop site B. That would represent the normal expectation of a middle ground, in that the patchwork of boat houses and undeveloped lands becomes more intensely developed, while the boundary of pristine lands remains the same. </p><p>

Thus the medium-density option would be more properly labeled as the "medium-density sprawl option": A "medium-density smart growth option" could get the same level of development by infilling the portion that is already developed. Thus, the feasibility study should either specify the more reasonable medium-density option which leaves A pristine, or clearly specify the two alternative medium scenarios with some text explaining why one might be preferred over the other. </p><p>

The fact that NPS would develop site A before having intensely developed B and C-without saying why--leads one to infer both that (a) NPS is less interested in preserving the environment and serving the public, than providing a development site convenient to Georgetown University and (b) but that NPS is trying to hide that preference instead of explaining it. If servicing Georgetown University is so important that it outweighs ordinary smart-growth considerations, the study should forthrightly state this so that members of the public do not waste time suggesting how to achieve the same level of boat house development with less environmental interference. It is not necessarily wrong for a federal agency to provide environmentally pristine land to a private entity; but structuring an analysis so that such an exchange will appear to be the result of selecting the medium option is dishonest. The feasibility study should forthrightly state that serving Georgetown University is the primary objective of the medium density scenario

having been specified so as to develop site A rather than C. </p><p>

2. The feasibility study should more clearly explain the implications of developing sites D and E on the layout and use of the Capital Crescent Trail. Too little detail is provided for one to understand the ramifications of either. </p><p>

3. The scenarios should not merely provide a final footprint, but should also consider the timing. In particular, one would assume that sites D and especially E are the most problematic as far as public amenities are concerned.

Therefore, the feasibility study should consider a staging which re-develops sites A, B, and C first, before deciding whether that is enough, or whether D should also be developed. </p><p>

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024

Correspondence: 274

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: James G. Titus
Organization: Maryland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6718 Glenn Dale Rd
Glenn Dale , MD 20769
USA
E-mail: jtitus@risingsea.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

(This version corrects editorial errors in my previous submission)

<p>If I correctly understand the purpose for which you are seeking public input, NPS is asking for comments on the feasibility study, but not for public comments on the ultimate decision that NPS will eventually make on this waterfront zoning. So I'll limit myself to deficiencies that I noticed in the study, which should be corrected before this study is used as a basis for a formal alternatives analysis.</p><p>

1. The specification of the three choices is seriously flawed, because the "medium" option is much more similar to the high-density than the low-density option. The most fundamental question on which the three options differ, is the extent to which a pristine riverfront will be replaced with boathouses-possibly private boat houses.

a. The high scenario is reasonable: All Five sites.

b. The low scenario is reasonable: only develop the site farthest away (site E) while leaving B and D as-is.

c. The obvious middle ground would be to develop sites E and C, while leaving B and D as-is, while leaving A pristine. Perhaps one might intensely develop site B. That would represent the normal expectation of a middle ground, in that the patchwork of boat houses and undeveloped lands becomes more intensely developed, while the boundary of pristine lands remains the same. </p><p>

Thus the medium-density option would be more properly labeled as the "medium-density sprawl option": A "medium-density smart growth option" could get the same level of development by infilling the portion that is already

developed. Thus, the feasibility study should either specify the more reasonable medium-density option which leaves A pristine, or clearly specify the two alternative medium scenarios with some text explaining why one might be preferred over the other. </p><p>

The fact that NPS would develop site A before having intensely developed B and C--without saying why--leads one to infer both that (a) NPS is less interested in preserving the environment and serving the public, than providing a development site convenient to Georgetown University and (b) but that NPS is trying to hide that preference instead of explaining it. If servicing Georgetown University is so important that it outweighs ordinary smart-growth considerations, the study should forthrightly state this so that members of the public do not waste time suggesting how to achieve the same level of boat house development with less environmental interference. It is not necessarily wrong for a federal agency to provide environmentally pristine land to a private entity; but structuring an analysis so that such an exchange will appear to be the result of selecting the medium option is dishonest. The feasibility study should forthrightly state that serving Georgetown University is the primary objective of the medium density scenario having been specified so as to develop site A rather than C. </p><p>

2. The feasibility study should more clearly explain the implications of developing sites A and B on the layout and use of the Capital Crescent Trail. Too little detail is provided for one to understand the ramifications of either. </p><p>

3. The scenarios should not merely provide a final footprint, but should also consider the timing. In particular, one would assume that sites B and especially A are the most problematic as far as public amenities are concerned. Therefore, the feasibility study should consider a staging which re-develops sites E, D, and C first, before deciding whether that is enough, or whether B should also be re-developed, and only after that should A be considered for development. </p><p>

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024 Correspondence: 275

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Chris Stomberg
Organization: Self/WCC
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, CA 20009
USA
E-mail: chris_stomberg@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Background about me: I am an avid paddler and cyclist. I currently access the river for kayaking between two and three times per week, and have recently joined the Washington Canoe Club after having kept a kayak at Jack's for a number of years. My bicycle is my main form of transportation. My wife and three young children share these

passions with me.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the Park Service for its commitment to increasing and enhancing access to the Potomac River for safe, healthy, and fun human-powered activity on the water. The Potomac is a unique and beautiful natural resource that deserves to be embraced in this way. Anyone who has had the experience of gliding up the river and watching the city vanish behind in just moments, or watching a beaver lazily swim by (yes, in Georgetown!), or breathing an exhausted sigh after crossing the finish line, understands the importance of this project. Its importance transcends its effect on our individual constituencies. Whether we are rowers, paddlers, or cyclists we all share a love of the river, its natural environment, and active enjoyment of that environment under our own power. Enhancing access will enable more of our youth to participate in rowing and kayaking programs, more local residents to get out on the water, and more of our visitors to know Washington from the river's unique and natural perspective. And further, getting people to use the river in this way can only serve to raise awareness and enhance stewardship of our natural resources, which surely are good things.

Having reviewed the proposals contained in the Feasibility Study released in April 2013, I feel the following are important for the Park Service to consider as it moves forward to the next stages of its planning:

1) I am glad to see public access for water craft emphasized in all three proposals. As a paddler with first-hand experience of the difficulty of gaining safe access to the river for a paddle (particularly with children), this is gratifying. Here are some specific thoughts with respect to development of these facilities

a. Beach access is very desirable for many paddlers, and should find its way into the next planning steps. Getting into and out of canoes and kayaks is more of a challenge at a dock than at a beach. As a one-time professional instructor, I can say this is true for both adults and children. It simply makes the sport more approachable ? particularly for people with mobility challenges. And, speaking as a parent, even if a child is wearing a PFD, it is reassuring to know that their misstep will result in a splash into inches of water rather than a plunge into several feet of potentially fast moving water. Thus beach access makes the river more accessible to those who are new to these water sports and encourages growth for future generations. Of course dock access is also useful and efficient since many types of boats ? such as single rowing shells and kayaks with fixed rudders ? are often more easily launched at docks. Hopefully these are not mutually exclusive considerations.

b. Expanded public and reasonably-priced off-water storage for personal kayaks, canoes, single shells, SUPs, etc. is another important element that should find its way into the next planning steps. This feature encourages routine enjoyment of the river by boaters who are likely to be very committed to the river and its future. Although a rental operation is essential, it does not address the needs of more experienced boaters who generally own boats that are more tailored to their skills, size, and needs. By encouraging the storage of personal boats in the NMBZ, fewer people would need to car-top their boats into the area for launching. This could significantly reduce the demand for parking and car trips on Water Street, since more people would be able to use bicycles or public transportation to get to the area. This is particularly important for younger generations moving into the Washington DC area for whom car ownership is on the decline, and encourages their use of the river. Moreover, the time-cost and hassle of getting a boat to the water is significantly reduced, thus making frequent use more likely.

c. An important element of the Medium- and High-density plans is the proposed construction of a public-access boat house for paddlers, single rowing shells, SUP boards etc. on Site A. But it is not clear that a large monolithic structure along the lines of the Charles River Boathouse in Boston is required for this purpose. For example, a modest structure could suffice to house the office requirements of a public-access rental operation and changing and restroom facilities for boaters. A slightly larger building might also house a meeting room for local clubs and off-water training/lessons, and perhaps a small food concession. A large structure is not the only way to provide boat storage. For example, roofed exterior racks (some examples of which can be found at WCC) could be an alternative. Although

these do not provide as complete weather protection for boats as a building, they have the advantage of being significantly lower in both cost and visual impact. Given the significant sensitivity many commenters have attached to development of this lot, lower impact alternatives such as this should be explored.

2) I am encouraged that all three proposals in the Feasibility Study embrace the continued presence of the Washington Canoe Club. As a new member of this club, I can attest to its uniqueness as an institution. It has a storied history with over a century in its present location and a landmark facility on the river. Its reputation for developing and encouraging youth and world-class athletes, including several Olympians, also places it uniquely in the national paddling community. But, the WCC is not just a racing club. It is a community of water-sports enthusiasts who share a love of the water, nature, the river and a commitment to its future. As the rope swing in the yard and the many child-sized PFDs testify, it is also a club that encourages families and the next generation to get out on the water in a safe and friendly environment. In short, its membership embodies precisely the values that development of the NMBZ seeks to encourage, and it will, no doubt, be a strong catalyst for the future success of the plan. Securing a stable future for the WCC and its facilities deserves a central place in all future planning.

3) A key element that has been embodied in all three of the options presented in the Feasibility Study is separation of paddling and rowing facilities. This is good, and a feature that should be preserved in future planning as a basic safety consideration. Fast multi-seat shells don't mix well in close proximity with canoes and kayaks. This is especially the case for a canoe and kayak rental operation whose users will be unaware of the limitations and needs of rowing teams. Keeping the paddlers to the west and the rowers to the east recognizes this need, and reduces the stress level for all involved.

4) A public canoe/kayak rental facility is probably best located to the West of its current location in the shadow of Key Bridge. Although this location has been used successfully in the past to encourage paddling by many newcomers and casual paddlers, it is not actually ideal for this. This is primarily because it is a dock-only facility located in relatively deep water surrounded by a shoreline with steep walls and rip-rap. The river current in this location is often significant and if one falls into the river there are few safe exits other than the dock. The dock may not even be an option depending on the current; immediately downstream are particularly craggy and steep walls. In short, it is not an ideal spot for newcomers and casual paddlers who do sometimes find themselves swimming rather than paddling. With careful development, the locations at either site A or C would likely offer a more encouraging introduction to the river.

5) Low density development is generally a good idea, and on balance I prefer the low-density option presented in the Feasibility Study. However, I also understand the significant unmet needs of the rowing community. I feel that encouraging more human powered uses of the river ? particularly among the younger generations trained by high-school and collegiate rowing programs ? is good. It secures the future of the river and its stewardship. I therefore feel that if greater density of boat house facilities is required to meet these needs ? e.g. as found in the medium density option ? then I would be happy to see these sites (D & E) used this way. Public access could be consolidated on site C and/or A.

6) As pretty much all users of this area would probably agree ? transportation and parking in this area are a paramount concern that will require careful consideration in the next phases of planning.

a) Steps to encourage access to the NMBZ by bike or public transit would likely relieve some of the inevitable pressure on parking likely introduced by development of this area.

b) As a cyclist, I would like to see a better designed interface for the Crescent Trail, and to have that be connected in a dedicated way to the newly-laid trail in the Waterfront Park. Water Street is one of the most heavily-used bicycle corridors in the city, but with its multiple stop signs, shifting lanes, back-in parking, confused drivers, etc. it is also one of the most dangerous stretches in the city. The NMBZ plan is an opportunity to move forward with the connection of

the Crescent Trail to the rest of the city, and to make the Waterfront Park section of trail more useful so that riders can finally get off of Water Street.

c) Although it is beyond the scope of the NMBZ plan, I would also like to see the trail in the Waterfront Park further connected with the Rock Creek trail.

d) Also, although also likely out of the Park Service's direct control, the creation of better public transportation options to access Water Street could alleviate some of the pressure on the parking and traffic situation.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 276**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Cynthia E. Cole
Organization: Washington Rowing School
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4004 52nd Street
Bladensburg, MD 20710
Bladensburg, MD 20710
USA
E-mail: cindy@washingtonrowingschool.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I wholeheartedly support the development of additional facilities for rowing on the Potomac River. These facilities should be within a no-wake zone of the river and protected from air and noise pollution sources, and high speed water vessels. Because restaurants, parking lots, and grass are important to the Georgetown community I am concerned that the proposed boathouse zone may not end up including many boathouses. If the number of sites is limited the best organizations for boathouses in the proposed zone may be the local schools whose students can access their facilities on foot. But area residents of all ages should have access to rowing facilities too. Access needs to be developed in other areas of the river to accomplish this. Upriver, downriver, and the Virginia shore need to be considered. Downriver sites will need to have the no-wake zone expanded in order to make those sites useable by rowers. There is clear need for more facilities on the river for rowing. Rowing is a healthy activity that should be supported by the Park Service. I look forward to some active support for this from the National Park Service.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 277

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Merrily Pierce
Organization: Former C & O Canal NHP Federal Advisory Commission
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1063 Carper Street
McLean, VA 22101
USA
E-mail: for_transit@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study

The following is a copy of the letter was approved submitted by the C & O Canal National Historical Park Federal Advisory Commission and submitted to the National Park Service as part of the original EIS for the Georgetown Boathouse in 2008 before the Commission was "sunsetting" by Congress in 2010. The Commission's former members remain active in supporting the mission of the Park.

While the Commission is no longer an official body, it should be noted that points made in the letter are consistent with the "Low Density" scenario presented in the current Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study.

The Low Density scenario also reinforces the former Commission's concern that no new private development be permitted within the C & O Canal National Historical Park and that any new facilities within the park should serve the public and be operated by the National Park Service.

The Low Density scenario is consistent with the mission of the Park and the former Commission to protect the natural, historic, and cultural resources of the Park while providing new boating facilities at a convenient location outside of the Park boundaries.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
Merrily Pierce, Commissioner
Commonwealth of Virginia (2004-2010)

Letter

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service
C & O Canal National Historical Park
C & O Canal NHP Federal Advisory Commission
1860 Dual Highway, Suite 100
Hagerstown, MD 21760

January 18, 2008

Kevin Brandt, Superintendent
C & O Canal National Historical Park
1860 Dual Highway, Suite 100
Hagerstown, MD 21760

RE: C & O Canal Federal Advisory Commission response to Public Notice by the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region; Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (Federal Register/Vol. 72, No. 231/Monday, December 3, 2007/Notices) regarding a proposal by the National Park Service (NPS) to permit Georgetown University (GU) to build a boathouse within the boundaries of the C & O Canal Historical Park in exchange for a parcel of land upriver owned by Georgetown University.

Dear Mr. Brandt:

The C & O Canal National Historic Park (NHP) Federal Advisory Commission was formed by Public Law 91-664, January 8, 1971 along with the creation of the Park. Its 19 citizen members are appointed for 6 year terms by the governors of the states of Maryland, West Virginia, and Virginia, and by the Mayor of Washington, DC respectively. The Commission meets with and consults with the Secretary or the Secretary's designee on general policies and specific matters related to the administration and development of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park.

As part of the above referenced process, the Commission submitted comments for the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Georgetown University Boathouse proposal published in April, 2006 (Attachment 1). One of the Commission's requests included the need for further analysis of the proposed project's impact that could be provided by an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Commission endorses, therefore, the NPS decision to proceed with an EIS. We believe strongly, however, that the EIS must have a much more comprehensive scope than that outlined in the Notice of Intent published on December 3, 2007.

In support of this position, and pursuant to the above notification as part of the requirements for the EIS, the Commission has four general areas of concern with respect to the proposed land exchange and construction of a boathouse on the

C and O Canal NHP: 1) Precedent for exchange of National Parkland involving a private entity, 2) Historic, environmental, cultural, and social impact on the Park, 3) Compatibility of the proposed project with policy and plans, and, 4) Process.

Land Exchange

? The 2006 EA states no net-loss of parkland with the proposed land exchange because both parcels are approximately the same size and the swap could increase positive impacts upstream. The Commission requests a fair market real estate assessment by an impartial agency of parcel 102-114, including its location as a C and O Canal National Historical Park gateway site, and a comparative assessment of the upstream parcel 102-109

purchased by Georgetown University in 1989. The EIS should analyze and disclose any constraints to construction on both parcels.

? Land use remains recreational but construction of the boathouse changes the land use of parcel 102-114 from public open space to private collegiate rowing use. The Commission believes that more people are served ? an estimated 3 million visitors annually - if parcel 102-114 remains public open space compared with the approximately 100 rowers plus many visitors and spectators who would use the same space in private ownership.

? The Commission requests a review of the entire land exchange proposal including: re-evaluation used to justify the exchange, whether it is consistent with the letter and intent of legislation that established the C & O NHP (see policy below), whether it improves the C & O Canal NHP, whether development of GU's upriver property as a team boathouse is actually feasible, and what other options are available.

? The Commission is concerned about precedent. Is there a precedent for exchanging NPS land with a private institution for the exclusive use of that institution? Is there a precedent within the 184.5 miles of the C & O Canal NHP? Please provide this information in the EIS.

? The C and O Canal NHP is a linear park 184.5 miles long running adjacent to the Potomac River from Georgetown to Cumberland, MD. The absence of any significant lateral dimension concentrates use on the narrow towpath already popular with recreational users. The land exchange would remove needed parkland in an historic gateway area with the Capital Crescent Trail and entrance to Georgetown where use is high. The EIS should justify the impact of the loss of lateral parkland at this gateway area.

Historical/Environmental/Cultural/Social Impact

? The boathouse would add a structure in a location that is currently open and vegetated changing the current view shed of the Potomac shoreline. The EA also recognizes that at some point any boathouse becomes a dominant visual element, interferes with existing views and would change the character of the existing view shed. The Commission asks that an EIS address significant impacts on the scenic impact from the C and O Canal NHP as well as the area from Key Bridge, George Washington Memorial Parkway, the Potomac Heritage Trail, the American Discovery Trail, and the Potomac Gorge.

? Under Alternatives A, B, and C, the proposed boathouse is located within three recognized historic areas: Georgetown Historic District, C and O Canal NHP, and the DC ? Potomac Gorge. These three alternatives would have the greatest negative impact on historical assets. The cumulative impact on these resources needs to be considered.

? The Commission believes that the evaluation of impacts on the C and O Canal NHP in the EIS should be made based on its designation and associated criteria as a National Historical Park.

? The Commission requests additional study of the potential impact of construction on sturgeon, other fish, birdlife, and fragile floodplain flora and fauna that are slowly coming back now that the water quality of the river is improving, as well as disruption of habitat and loss of tree canopy.

? The EIS should also consider the increase in the amount of hard fill needed for the project on the shoreline not only for building structural support and erosion control, but subsequent reduction of habitat for wading birds.

? Further hydrological analysis is needed regarding regular and high water flow around protruding docks and dock pilings which other boathouses on the river currently do not have.

? The embankment below the canal should be analyzed for erosion impacts of flood velocity that could undermine its stability.

? The 2006 EA notes that the currently corroding underground 84-inch diameter Upper Potomac Interceptor (sewer) Pipeline would be encased before construction. Temporary repair of aging infrastructure only buys time before an expensive replacement might be needed. The impact of leaks and possible rupture on the C & O Canal NHP and the cost of replacement of the Pipeline in this section, on water quality and health of visitors should be considered now, as well as by the EIS during and after the proposed construction of a boathouse.

? Parcel 102-114 is filled soil and the EA notes that in addition to the soils not being native to the site, they are "slightly contaminated" by heavy metals subjecting the river to this runoff. That runoff will not necessarily be contained or minimized under a built structure. Stability and composition of the soil need further analysis when

considering whether both sites are suitable for construction.

? Parcel 102-114 is impacted by canal water seepage. Hydrology needs to be taken into consideration if parcel is considered as a building site.

? Stormwater management for quantity control has been preliminarily waived by the District of Columbia, Watershed Protecting Division, because stormwater detention during low tide is counterproductive. Runoff sources include impervious building surfaces such as roof, docks, ramps, walkways, and offsite surfaces from the towpath and the CCT. The proposed Boathouse could increase impervious surface by up to 42% not including the 2,500 sq ft dock. Stormwater runoff impacts need further analysis.

? Should the land exchange occur, the EA is silent on who would pay for correcting the DC WASA easement recordation error on a facility that could be impacted by construction, nor are costs estimated for the NPS to negotiate arrangements with DC WASA or the WCC which now also uses part of Parcel 102-114. The EIS should be more specific with respect to expenses incurred by the NPS.

? Odor control has not been successful along the canal. The EIS needs to address this issue at the proposed site.

? The C and O Canal NHP towpath is especially crowded on weekends at this gateway location with the CCT. During GU rowing regattas, now scheduled only during the Spring season, foot and vehicle traffic could increase as rowers cross the canal with boats on trailers and visitors and spectators create additional foot traffic as well. The Commission is concerned about such activity on the ability of visitors to the C & O Canal NHP to appreciate the natural and historic setting that the site now affords and asks that the impact of such additional traffic, both motorized and pedestrian, be further examined.

? Transporting of boats on motorized trailers that can be up to 60 feet long along and across the narrow, busy C and O Canal NHP towpath has the potential for creating additional use of parkland and raises maintenance concerns. The maintenance budget for the C & O Canal NHP continues to be cut by Congress and the Federal Government. The Commission asks that any additional cost for maintenance of the park that would be necessitated by the use of private boat trailers and other equipment and personnel vehicles be estimated and what provision would be made by GU to compensate the NPS.

? GU's regattas are now scheduled only during the Spring rowing season. With a large boathouse at the proposed location, it can be expected that additional events could eventually be scheduled during the summer and fall seasons as well ? peak periods of park use. The Commission asks, therefore, that maintenance and traffic concerns and the potential for interference with park visitors be considered throughout the year.

Compatibility with Policy and Plans

? The C and O Canal NHP was established by Congressional Legislation in 1971 " to preserve and interpret the historic and scenic features of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, and to develop the potential of the canal for public recreation." (1995 EA). The EIS should explain how restricting the public from an acre of land benefits the public and public recreation.

? The EIS should be conducted in terms of legislative and policy intent and history for the C & O Canal NHP, the National Capital Park Commission plan to protect and preserve the shoreline of the Potomac River upstream from Georgetown that preceded the establishment of the C & O Canal NHP, the Capper-Crampton Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the original and amended Georgetown Waterfront Park Plan.

? Under Alternatives A, B, and C, the proposed Boathouse would be built on exchanged land that is beyond the originally planned limits of the Boat Zone (1150 feet west of Key Bridge) as designated in the 1987 Potomac Waterfront Park Plan. Original Plan language states: "Floating boathouses or boathouses on land would be appropriate provided public boating use of the facilities is always available." (emphasis ours). The EIS should explain how the language is compatible with the proposed project?

? The 2006 EA states that the land exchange has been approved by the NCPC consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital stating that the proposed use would not negatively affect the Potomac River Waterfront, the Waterfront Park, or the C and O Canal NHP. The report also notes that the proposed site is under Federal ownership and not subject to Washington, DC zoning controls. The University and the NPS have received approval to designate Parcel 102-114 within the W-O Zone, (new category created in 2002 that permits boathouses and marinas

as a special exception permitted use) once the land exchange agreement is in place and the University gains ownership of the property. Again, the EIS should explain how the proposal provides for continuing public availability for boaters. Please expand on the information provided in the EA?

? The 2006 EA is silent on the US Code with respect to the National Park Service in saying that no activities are to be authorized "in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been or shall be directly and specifically provided by Congress." (16 USC Sec 1 - a - 1). The EIS should justify 1) the exchange, and, 2) the proposed Boathouse with respect to US Code.

? The EA is silent on the following NPS and C and O Canal NHP Policies and Plans. The EIS should address the proposed land exchange in light of written policy.

o National Park Service Mission Statement (from The National Park System Caring for the American Legacy) (www.nps.gov/legacy/mission.html)

? "The National Park Service preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations . . ."

? National Park Service also fills the role of "guardian of our diverse cultural and recreational resources; environmental advocate; world leader in the parks and preservation community; and pioneer in the drive to protect America's open space."

o Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Plan (NPS 1976, pages 1, 2)

? "[The Plan provides for] as much outdoor recreation as will not intrude upon or impair the resources which the park was established to protect."

? [The Purpose of the Park] . . . is to provide, in perpetuity, the opportunity for mankind . . . to understand the canal's reason for being, its construction, its role in transportation, etc., . . . to appreciate the setting in which it lies and the natural and human history that can be studied along its way . . . to enjoy the recreational use of the canal, the parklands and the adjacent Potomac River.

? Management Objectives . . . which will be administered in the historical category of the National Park System , are

a) Preserve the atmosphere of past times and enduring natural beauty and safeguard historic remains and natural features

b) Impart to visitors an understanding and appreciation of an historic way of life blended into the natural setting of the Potomac Valley.

c) Develop the potential of the park's recreation resources for safe yet stimulating enjoyment by the visitors within the limits compatible with its management objectives.

? Recognition in the Plan that "the urban need for manmade playgrounds which provide structured recreational facilities can not be met by the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park. Instead, the role of the park is to provide its visitors with a natural and historic environment in which to enjoy such pursuits as hiking, biking, canoeing, camping, horseback riding, fishing, and boating."

Process

? The Commission requests revision of the introductory material presented as background on the NPS PEPC web site concerning the Georgetown University Boathouse/Land Transfer EIS as follows: Add as part of the opening sentence in third paragraph "The C & O Canal NHP was established in 1971 as part of the National Park System." In the same paragraph, amend the final sentence which reads "The proposed Georgetown University Boathouse would be located within this boathouse zone" to "within or partly within this boathouse zone." Fourth paragraph currently reads, "The property would be made available to the University in exchange for prime wooded shoreline property within the C & O Canal NHP and its one-mile access easement along the Capital Crescent Trail that the University owns." It should read "One of the alternative sites is within the C & O Canal National Historical Park. That site would be made available to the University in exchange for wooded shoreline property that is also within the C & O Canal NHP, and for the University's one-mile access easement along the Capital Crescent Trail."

? We request a cumulative impact analysis of all boathouses now proposed for construction/improvement in the designated "Boat Zone" of the Georgetown Waterfront Park Plan.

? The EIS should include a detailed map of all land parcels within the project area including the Georgetown Waterfront Park Plan Boathouse Zone from District of Columbia Land Records that shows parcel delineation and ownership. How much private land is within the C and O Canal NHP? How much private land lies within the Boathouse Zone and in land beyond the designated Boathouse Zone that could be zoned for a boathouse under the W-O provision by special exception? How much public land, if any, has been transferred to private ownership within the Boathouse Zone and beyond since its creation. What other exchanges are planned or could be anticipated in the project area in the future?

? The EIS should justify the need for a comprehensive study as required by NEPA that addresses all of the recreational needs of the waterfront area, including boathouses that could impact the C & O Canal NHP.

? The EIS should also consider alternative sites for the Georgetown Boathouse and the environmental impacts of each alternative site.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our comments.

Sincerely,

Sheila Rabb Weidenfeld, Chairman

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 278**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Emily Mechner
Organization: Family
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Washington, DC 20009
USA
E-mail: emily@mechner.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
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 the NPS proposals for development of the waterfront. As enthusiasts of human-powered recreation (especially kayaking and bicycling), my family and I are very excited to look forward to better river access with the realization of some version of these plans.

When my family wants to go paddling, we usually have to leave the city. This is because there is no public put-in place suitable for small children. Jack's allows visitors to launch at their dock for a fee, but we have never done it with the kids on account of the strong current and deep water.

To summarize the essential elements of a plan for wider public small-craft access to the river, it should have:

*both beach and dock launch facilities, so that children and beginners, as well as more experienced paddlers and various kinds of craft, can enter the water safely.

*a location where current is not normally strong

*a location where boat paths do not cross with multi-seat rowing shells

*restroom and changing facilities

*bicycle parking and day-use lockers to encourage car-free access

*equipment available for rental, and a facility to support the rental concession

*secure storage (for rent) for personal boats (kayaks, canoes, single shells, sup's, etc.)

*a driveway/car access, for bringing boats to and from the put-in and boat storage areas

*nearby parking

*a place for people to sit and hang out comfortably on shore, to eat and drink, wait for friends, or relax before or after going on the water.

I would like to make a few observations about the suitability of the proposed developments for these purposes.

First, that only site A offers an obvious possibility of beach entry. Even at site C, the bank is steep and rocky--beach access would probably be more difficult to engineer. For the other items, either site A or C would probably work. But D would not, on account of the Potomac Boat club upstream of it and the deep, rushing current near the Key Bridge.

Second, that a large boat house is not remotely necessary to achieve these functionalities. Storage for watercraft does not require climate control or total weather protection. Sheds or covered racks work as well. I share the misgivings of many who oppose the development of site A with a large boat house, and urge consideration of a lower-impact design that supports access without overwhelming the nearby capital crescent trail and historic canoe club building.

Third, that parking is a serious issue. People need cars to bring their small human-powered craft to the water. Site C, as in the medium and low-density proposals, would be a suitable place for parking to serve users of small-craft facilities at A and B, as well as a boat ramp or dock. It would also serve as a buffer between smaller upstream craft and larger downstream rowing facilities. It is hard to imagine where else parking could be inserted in the plan, and the lack of it would seriously compromise the usability and accessibility of the boating facilities.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024 Correspondence: 279

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Dom J. (DJ) Manalo
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Assn/Washington Kayak Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Rockville, MD 20850
USA
E-mail: dmanalo2k@yahoo.com

E-mail: joreynolds@vermontel.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a former C&O Canal Advisory Commissioner, I respectfully advocate the lowest possible density approach to whatever use is approved for the boat zone. We worked relentlessly as a Commission to eliminate private use of public lands and I reaffirm that position. Public land is for public access and use.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 281**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Bernice A. Lochstampfor
Organization: C&OCA and Friends of the Great Falls Tavern
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DC 20036
USA
E-mail: ann.lochstampfor@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Since I do not know if the submissions of March 30, 2012 will be included in this step, I am including my comments submitted then because any legitimate consideration of changing the nature and character of the C&OCNHP must be based on the mission and purpose upon which this national historical park was founded. As our nation faces an era of increasingly devastating and unpredictable weather events and aging infrastructure failures, the federal government ? and the Department of Interior, in particular -- must lead by protecting and preserving the lands it holds in trust for future generations. That includes rivers and shorelines. The White House is only a few miles from the stretch of the Potomac River where an elite private university plans to

construct a colossal boathouse. No one can foresee what the impact of that development would be when a natural disaster caused by global warming occurs. Has this risk been adequately addressed? The least disturbance to the Potomac River and its shoreline offered by the "Low Density Scenario" will best serve future generations of Americans.

NPS Feasibility Study Submission by Ann Lochstampfor on March 30, 2012

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

The 34th Street entrance to the proposed boathouse zone is only a 15-20 minute walk from The White House (17th Street side.) This site embraces Potomac shoreline now in a wooded, tidal floodplain area. The NPS has yet to disclose what the "fair market value" of this treasured section of the Park would be -- if it were privately owned. Since the C&OCNHP is funded by all American taxpayers not just those in DC and Maryland, the C&OCNHP is owned by and belongs to all Americans. They have a vested interest in preserving their "National Treasure" for all Americans, present and future. This transfer of the public wealth ? history as well as financial -- to a wealthy private university should not be allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 282

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: James Freis

Organization: Potomac Boat Club
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DC 20008
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am writing in strong support of the High Density Development Scenario 1, with the largest reasonable buildings on each of Sites A, C, D, and E, as well as maximum restoration and rehabilitation and improvement of Site B. The development efforts should begin as soon as possible without further study and without further delay, following decades of debate. The study makes clear that there is an incredible amount of demand, continuing to grow, for development and riverfront access around these sites for recreational use. Hence the only question is the level of development. The only sensible answer is maximum development of this tiny portion of a mighty river with largely protected natural coastline in the middle of a large metropolitan area.

The city of Washington exists here today because of the Potomac River and natural port in the river bend at Georgetown. Over time the city lost its natural connection to the river which used to be filled with non-motorized boats exactly in this area. So much of the context of this feasibility study is spent on looking at the neighboring parcels of property that we can lost sight of the big picture. The big picture shows we need to pursue high density development for the following reasons:

1. We are looking at developing nonmotorized boat access to the river ? not for one university or a select few (essentially just expanding the existing situation a little more), but rather making this prized river access available to more of the so many people who have expressed interest.
2. This small waterfront access is one of the only areas in the greater Washington area that has any option of river access (Old Town Alexandria being the other for those from the southeast of the city). Almost all of the rest of the river frontage is protected and inaccessible or otherwise developed. This has to be a solution for the city and the region (including the Virginia side right across the Key Bridge).
3. A few persons have objected because of the impact on the tiniest portion of the C&O Canal area and Capital Crescent trail. Developing the waterfront to the maximum density would make those other resources more rather than less attractive. The lack of parking in any option, together with the promotion of healthy, recreational water access, means we can expect more people to use bicycles to access the area.
4. The expanding for demand at the high school and collegiate crew levels is increasing demand for lifelong interest in rowing and other water sports, and a passion of committed persons to introduce friends to the water on an occasional or less regular basis. Any development other than the high density one will prove shortsighted as demand continues to outstrip supply.

I visited the area yesterday to walk around and examine in light of the Feasibility Study. It is a terrible eyesore throughout which attracts from the beauty of the river, the revitalized Georgetown waterfront, and the parkland

moving upstream. Many people have remarked how unsafe and uncomfortable they feel walking the undeveloped stretch under the Key Bridge. The development needs to start now; not wait for further study.

As to my own background ? as a small child I saw a crew race on a river that I remember to this day. I first rowed at Georgetown, and was on the varsity heavyweight crew for four years. I have continued that passion for over twenty years ? living in Boston, Switzerland, and now again in Washington where I am a member of the Potomac Boat Club and went rowing yesterday. I see virtually every day I am on the water how people along the river edge parkland, from the airport up through Georgetown and past Chain Bridge stop and enjoy watching the boats along the water. Providing more people access to the water enhances the enjoyment not only for them, but also for all the people on the shore, including the walkers and cyclists. I say this also as an avid cyclist who uses the Capital Crescent trail, the Rock Creek trail, and enjoy the national park land. Most people I introduce to the river is not by rowing, but by canoe or traditional rowboat, and sometimes a kayak, and they all wish to come back and to have greater access.

Please let us proceed now with the High Density version of this worthy and long overdue option for the benefit of the city and all of its people.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 283**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Nathaniel J. Tisa
Organization: Georgetown University Student Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 316 Leavey Center
37th and O Streets NW
Washington, DC 20057
USA
E-mail: gusapresident@georgetown.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

May 24, 2013

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

Dear Mr. May:

We wish to thank you and the National Park Service for conducting the feasibility study and for allowing public comment on this important matter. After reviewing the Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study and attending the May 22nd Public Information Meeting, the Georgetown University Student Association (GUSA) has several insights to offer on behalf of university students.

GUSA serves as the formal, elected representative of over seven thousand Georgetown undergraduates. In this capacity, we represent the interests of the men's and women's crew teams, both of which have a significant stake in decisions made by the National Park Service relating to the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone. We also work closely with other student government bodies throughout the District to advocate for the needs of students.

On the whole, our organization stresses that the National Park Service should prioritize the needs of nonmotorized boat users, and that any decision should expand existing opportunities for such users to a degree to meet the dramatic growth in demand.

Georgetown University students, especially student-athletes, are extremely interested in a new boathouse. The present Thompson Boat Club facilities are extremely overbooked, which not only limits Georgetown rowers, but also the hundreds of high-school rowers from local communities. Therefore, rewarding the interest in a new boathouse for Georgetown University will result in tangible community benefits for all by freeing up significant space at Thompson's. Furthermore, Georgetown students are highly involved in volunteer activities that benefit countless people throughout the District, and GUSA would ensure that this spirit of volunteerism applies to the new boathouse facility. In this vein, when the new boathouse is built, the university has plans to develop programming that will enrich the lives of youth that would not otherwise have had exposure to rowing and other sports, which it cannot pursue within the current restraints of Thompson Boathouse. The university is also exploring programming that would enable members of the Wounded Warriors Program to benefit from the facility as well.

In terms of available sites, after reviewing the alternatives, GUSA firmly believes that the high-density option is the only choice that provides anywhere near adequate space for nonmotorized boat users. Other options fail to take into account the existing high demand for facilities to support rowing programs, and any of them would run contrary to the long term efforts to meet that demand.

Upon review of the high-density option, as currently designed, we are concerned that boathouses which could be located at Sites A and D would likely be too small to accommodate the high levels of demand associated with university rowing programs. Site C, with the divide envisioned as necessary for access to the sewer line in place, also appears impractical. Site E is potentially large enough to accommodate nonmotorized boat users; however, we understand that might be encumbered by a land exchange agreement. All of these factors raise serious concerns that we fear could significantly limit options for Georgetown University to build a boathouse to meet the needs of our long-standing rowing programs for men and women.

Regarding Site B, participants in the March 3, 2012 Public Stakeholder Workshop discussed moving the Washington Canoe Club, which has fallen into disrepair, upstream to or toward Site A. Elizabeth Merritt of the National Trust for Historic Preservation testified at the workshop that the historic integrity of the structure could be preserved if it were moved.

If the Washington Canoe Club were relocated and repaired, a boathouse large enough to accommodate the needs of nonmotorized boat users could then be built on a combination of parts of Sites A and B. GUSA supports this option, as it would make it possible to preserve the historic integrity of the Washington Canoe Club while providing adequate space to meet rising levels of demand for other users.

The Georgetown University rowing program is the oldest program in the city with a rich history of medals at Dad Vails, Eastern Sprints, IRAs, and NCAAs, and its interests need to be taken into consideration when developing the NMBZ. Building a boathouse for Georgetown's programs will not only allow it to thrive but it will open up space and opportunity for programs rowing out of the Thompson Boathouse. Furthermore, through our volunteer efforts, students have a strong positive impact on the community, which would extend to the construction of a new facility. GUSA immensely appreciates the efforts of the National Park Service thus far to keep the public informed on this matter, and we look forward to future cooperation.

Sincerely,

Nate Tisa
President
Georgetown University Student Association

Adam Ramadan
Vice President
Georgetown University Student Association

Jack Devlin
Captain
Georgetown Men's Lightweight Crew Team

Lauren Abrams
Captain
Georgetown Women's Openweight Team

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 284**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Louis C. Balodemas
Organization: B-CC Crew Boosters, Inc.
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4870 Chevy Chase Blvd
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
USA
E-mail: balarch@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013	Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form
Notes:	

Correspondence Text

I currently serve as president of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School rowing team, representing 96 student-athletes and their families. We are a co-ed club team and operate as a non-profit corporation, B-CC Crew Boosters, Inc. We are nearing completion of our 19th season and have rented rack space and rowed out of Thompson Boat Center (TBC) for that entire time. Weather-permitting, our team practices on the water every weekday afternoon, both fall and spring.

Due to the impacts of severe overcrowding at TBC, we strongly support expedited planning, development and construction of all the boathouses identified in the NPS NMBZ Feasibility Study's "Scenario 1 - High Density". The data in the study, and the experience of our team and our fellow club teams currently housed at TBC, show that demand for boat storage and river access exceed what would be provided under Scenarios 2 and 3.

Further, we see "Site E" as a logical starting point because its development is included under all three scenarios examined in the Study. "Site E" also has potential for fast-track completion because its location has no impact on the C&O Canal, the Capital Crescent Trail or DC Water facilities.

The Study does a good job of evaluating criteria and presenting options, but it does not put forth a plan of action. We ask that NPS publish such a plan showing all planning, funding, design, and construction milestones and end dates, and that "Site E" be carried as a fast-track component through the process.

We appreciate the opportunity to put these comments into the record.

Respectfully,

Lou Balodemas
President
B-CC Crew Boosters, Inc.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 285**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Elizabeth S. Merritt
Organization: National Trust for Historic Preservation
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1785 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
USA
E-mail: emerritt@savingplaces.org

Correspondence Information

Status: New	Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013	Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1	Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No	Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

May 24, 2013

Ms. Tammy Stidham
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive SW
Washington, D.C. 20242

Re: Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study

Dear Tammy:

The National Trust for Historic Preservation appreciates the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study dated April 2013. The Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone is located entirely within a National Historic Landmark ("NHL")-the Georgetown Historic District. As you know, the National Trust participated in the public workshop regarding the planning process for the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone on March 3, 2012. And back in 2006, we provided comments on the NPS's Georgetown University Boathouse Environmental Assessment and requested consulting party status for the project under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act ("NHPA"). Our 2006 comments expressed concerns about the inappropriate scale of the proposed Georgetown boathouse and its potential adverse impacts on historic resources.

We are therefore pleased that the NPS commissioned a broad planning study to assess the feasibility of potential uses and development within the nonmotorized boathouse zone ("NMBZ") located along the Georgetown waterfront. A comprehensive approach is more likely to result in a plan that will appropriately guide future development to address the high demand for rowing and other boating activities on the Potomac River, while minimizing and mitigating adverse impacts to the historic resources in the area.

We offer the following comments to assist the NPS and future project proponents in ensuring that the Feasibility Study will enable all parties to develop and evaluate alternatives or modifications to proposed undertakings that would "avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties." 36 C.F.R. 800.6(a).

I. The Feasibility Study Should Include an Analysis of Options for Redevelopment and/or Expansion of the Thompson Boat Center.

The Feasibility Study focuses on the potential development within the NMBZ, which extends along the Potomac River from 34th Street at the western edge of Georgetown Waterfront Park to approximately a quarter mile upriver of the Key Bridge. Five proposed development parcels were assessed that include two existing historic boathouses/clubs. However, the Feasibility Study fails to assess potential redevelopment and/or expansion opportunities for the Thompson Boat Center site ("Thompsons")-a boathouse owned by the NPS that is less than a mile from the NMBZ. Thompsons is the only boathouse in the vicinity that currently provides open public access for nonmotorized boating on the Potomac River. Therefore, the feasibility of redeveloping and/or expanding Thompsons should be considered in the Feasibility Study, since it directly impacts the magnitude of the unfulfilled needs for nonmotorized boating facilities within the NMBZ.

The Feasibility Study relies heavily on the use, inadequacies^[1] and demands of Thompsons to justify the need to

develop additional nonmotorized boating facilities along the Georgetown waterfront. The Feasibility Study states that "[m]ost boating activity within the NMBZ launches from Thompson Boat Center, which estimates that the following use the facility regularly: 800-850 high school students, 250-300 university students, 100-150 renters, [and] 40-60 students in Thompson Boat Center programs." [2] Feasibility Study at 16. This compares to the estimated 300 members at each of the Potomac Boat Club ("PBC") and the Washington Canoe Club (the "Canoe Club"). Id. at 15.

Thompsons must be evaluated in the Feasibility Study because it directly impacts the NMBZ and because "there is likely not sufficient developable land within the nonmotorized boathouse zone ? to accommodate all user demand." Id. at 52. Issues at Thompsons are cited in the Feasibility Study as the rationale for developing the NMBZ. Furthermore, it is likely that redevelopment and expansion of Thompsons would have less adverse impact on historic resources given its location.

We do not question the high demand for rowing, paddling and other boating facilities along the Potomac River, but we do question the NPS's failure to assess redevelopment opportunities for its own boathouse, which is "considered a hindrance to excellent rowing programs and fair and equitable access to the river." Id. at i. Therefore, we strongly encourage the NPS to assess the feasibility of expanding Thompsons as part of the Feasibility Study. The NPS should consider developing Thompsons into a larger-scale community boathouse such as Community Rowing, Inc.'s recently constructed Harry Parker Boathouse on the Charles River in Watertown, Massachusetts.

II. Comments on Each of the Potential Development Sites.

The National Trust agrees with the statements in the Feasibility Study that additional studies will need to be conducted to comply with federal preservation and other laws prior to the development of any of the individual sites, particularly since the NMBZ includes and is adjacent to several historic resources and is entirely within the Georgetown NHL Historic District. As a result, Section 110(f) of the NHPA requires that, prior to approving any undertaking that may directly and adversely affect an NHL, the federal agency must ensure that the plans will minimize harm to the NHL "to the maximum extent possible." 16 U.S.C. 470h-2(f) (emphasis added).

Our suggestions and comments on the proposed development densities seek to "to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties." 36 C.F.R. 800.1(a). Each of the five development sites are discussed below.

Site A. Site A is located within the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park ("C&O Canal") and adjacent to the National Register-listed Washington Canoe Club. This is the site previously proposed for the Georgetown Boathouse. With other, less harmful sites now being considered, we support the Low Density Development Scenario, since trailhead enhancements and pier and beach launching will have the least adverse impact on the C&O Canal and the Canoe Club. If any development were to occur on this site, then it must be appropriate in scale to the Canoe Club, and should involve little or no vehicular access to the trail, as we discussed in our 2006 letter. [3] A 7,800-square-foot boathouse, as proposed in the Medium-Density and High-Density Scenarios, would certainly be less harmful than the 33,771-square-foot boathouse proposed by Georgetown University in 2006. However, we strongly recommend avoiding the construction of any new buildings on this site. Additional storage for paddlecraft and sculls for the Canoe Club could be provided through the installation of movable boat racks on this site with minimal impacts.

Site B. Site B contains the National Register-listed Washington Canoe Club. We strongly support the recommendation in the Feasibility Study to retain and rehabilitate this historic structure, under all of the development scenarios. We were impressed by the strong consensus among all stakeholders at the March 2012 workshop in support of the preservation of this iconic building. We recommend that the docks for the Canoe Club could be extended to increase access to the river without negatively impacting the historic structure. However, we are very concerned about the deteriorated condition (and the ongoing deterioration) of this historic building, and the NPS's failure to properly maintain the structure. If the NPS fails to properly maintain and repair this historically significant

structure, it runs the risk of engaging in demolition by neglect. We understand that the NPS has evicted the Canoe Club from the building because of its unsafe condition, and that structural stabilization activities have begun. The National Trust received a nomination from the Canoe Club in February 2013 for the National Trust's list of America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places. In support of the Canoe Club's efforts to preserve the building, the National Trust has awarded a grant to the Canoe Club to help fund a historic structures report for the building. However, we are concerned that the NPS appears to expect the Canoe Club to fund the entire preparation of such a report, rather than taking responsibility to fund and conduct such a study directly. The National Trust would appreciate the opportunity for a site visit to the Canoe Club with the NPS in order to better understand its current condition.

Site C. Site C is a vacant lot located between the historic Canoe Club and the National Register-listed Alexandria Aqueduct, and close to the National Register-listed Potomac Boat Club.[4] The High Density Development Scenario proposes a three-story boathouse composed of two buildings with a shared apron. The Medium Density and Low Density Development Scenarios both recommend that Site C be developed as a car-top launch site with parking. In our view, although parking in the area certainly needs to be addressed, a parking lot is not an appropriate use of prime riverfront property. Other appropriate uses of Site C would include: allowing the Canoe Club and/or the PBC to install temporary outdoor boat storage racks; constructing a boathouse that is compatible in scale and design with the two adjacent historic boathouses; or constructing a public dock without an accompanying boathouse or parking.

Sites D & E. Sites D and E flank the Key Bridge and are the most appropriate sites in the NMBZ for larger new boathouses. However, any new boathouse on Site D should not be more than one story higher than the PBC, in an effort to minimize the impact on the adjacent historic boathouse. Site E is the most appropriate site for a large boathouse in the NMBZ. We also recommend that, if Sites D and E are made available to universities, incentives should be provided to encourage the universities to share space with other programs, in order to help alleviate crowding at other facilities, particularly at Thompsons.

We also encourage the NPS to consider other locations for boathouses-and additional measures besides the construction of new boathouses-to address the demand for rowing, paddling and other nonmotorized boating activities along the Potomac River. As previously discussed, docks at existing boathouses can be lengthened, outdoor storage racks can be installed adjacent to existing boathouses, and Thompsons could be expanded (both the building and its docks).

III. Other Comments and Considerations.

First, we recommend that the NPS provide basic renderings of each of the development scenarios so that the potential impacts on historic resources and viewsheds can be better understood by the public.

Second, we are aware that the NPS is currently in the process of developing a draft Environmental Impact Statement for a potential boathouse along the Arlington, Virginia shore of the Potomac River (the "Arlington EIS"). Both NEPA and Section 106 of the NHPA require the assessment and consideration of reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts related to federal undertakings.[5] Since a boathouse on the Arlington side of the Potomac River is "reasonably foreseeable," it should be analyzed in concert with proposed development scenarios within the NMBZ. Similarly, the Arlington EIS must consider the cumulative impacts of the proposed boathouses for the NMBZ. In addition to cumulative impacts, the potential development of an Arlington boathouse is relevant to the analysis of how much additional boathouse capacity is needed over on the Georgetown side of the Potomac River. Opportunities may also exist to site new boathouses in Alexandria, Anacostia, and elsewhere.

Third, we recommend that the Virginia State Historic Preservation Office be included in the consultation process related to any development within the NMBZ, not only because of the relationship with the proposed Arlington boathouse, but also because any construction within the NMBZ will be visible across the Potomac River and may

have a potential visual impact on historic resources in Virginia.

Fourth, we recommend that the NPS take a closer look at the rowing facility requirements of each program, as set forth in Table 2, Summary of Rowing Facility Requirements, before making any decisions about the size of new boathouses based on program requirements. Given the limited developable space in the NBMZ, decisions regarding boathouse development should be founded on actual need, and the requirements claimed by some of the programs appear inflated. For example, Table 2 states that Georgetown University has 180 athletes and requires 55 eights, and that George Washington University has 100 athletes and requires 40 eights. An eight is a racing shell that seats 8 rowers and 1 coxswain. Based on the number of eights requested by each university program, the boats would support a team of 495 athletes at Georgetown University and 360 athletes at George Washington University.[6] These numbers are unrealistic and far exceed typical university rowing programs in the United States. Instead of simply accepting these university requests at face value, the NPS should evaluate the reasonable requirements of various rowing programs based on the current size of the programs and their fleets, while providing realistic room for growth.

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the Feasibility Study, and we encourage the NPS to continue to evaluate additional ways to satisfy the demand for nonmotorized boating on the Potomac River. We look forward to participating as consultation continues regarding the nonmotorized boathouse zone on the Georgetown waterfront.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth S. Merritt, Esq.
Deputy General Counsel

cc: David Maloney and Tim Dennee, DC SHPO
Kathleen Kilpatrick, VA SHPO
Katry Harris, Caroline Hall and Reid Nelson, ACHP
Nancy MacWood, Comm. of 100 on the Federal City
Barbara D. Morgan, DC Federation of Civic Associations
Sally Strain, Defenders of Potomac River Parkland
Rebecca Miller, DC Preservation League
Andrew Soles and Christopher Brown, Washington Canoe Club
Edward Ryan, Potomac Boat Club

ENDNOTES:

1. The inadequacies of Thompsons were cited throughout the Feasibility Study and included, but are not limited to: not enough boat storage, lack of alternative activities for high school teams (ergometers, exercise machines, and meeting space), and insufficient launching space. See Feasibility Study at 21-22.

2. The Study also states that "two universities and twelve high schools conduct their crew team practices from Thompson Boat Center, and independent rowers launch their private racing shells from Thompson Boat Center ?." Feasibility Study at 16.

3. See Letter from Elizabeth S. Merritt, National Trust for Historic Preservation, to Kevin Brandt, Superintendent, C & O Canal Nat'l Historical Park, NPS (June 15, 2006).

4. The Feasibility Study erroneously states (at p.32) that the Potomac Boat Club is merely eligible for the National Register. This should be corrected to clarify that the Potomac Boat Club is National Register-listed.

5. NEPA requires taking a "hard look" at the cumulative impacts, "which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions ? [and] can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." 40 C.F.R. 1508.7. The Section 106 regulations also state that adverse effects "may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur late in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative." 36 C.F.R. 800.5(a)(1).

6. This example does not factor in athletes that could be accommodated in smaller boats (pairs and fours) requested or required by the university programs.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 286**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: John Forster
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Washington, DC 20007
USA
E-mail: jforster01@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been privileged to be a supporter of non-motorized use of the Potomac River since I learned to row at Georgetown University in 1965. I was a rowing coach at GU from 1976 to 1986 and was responsible as the Head Coach for overseeing a program of approximately 125 undergraduate men and women rowers and 6 to 8 coaches. I was proud to be able to assist through lending of equipment and time the commencement of the rowing program at Wilson High School, the first DC high school to have a rowing team in modern times. I am a Georgetown resident and continue to support efforts for a fair and long-term perspective for our environment.

Participation in rowing on the high school, collegiate, and club levels from youth through masters rowing that includes

competitive racing even for those into their nineties has been phenomenal. For the last forty years, the major barrier to greater numbers and quality of rowing in the metropolitan DC region has been the prohibition of boathouses by the Federal government.

I regret that the National Park Service (NPS) has failed to prioritize direct water access for non-motorized recreation. Though time and time again over the past several decades major, non-water-dependent construction and changes have been planned and completed throughout the Georgetown waterfront. A truly regrettable situation is that for years the NPS led Georgetown University to believe that it would trade a parcel of land west of Key Bridge along the Potomac river for a parcel of land on the west side of the Potomac Canoe Club. As a result, GU's rowing team would be able to have a boathouse just below its campus and the NPS would have a continuous stretch of public parkland along the Potomac River west of the proposed GU boathouse site. It would be beneficial to both parties as well as to the community and the general public.

GU always proceeded in good faith through many years of rigorous architectural, environmental, and legal qualifications and expenses to fulfill ever-changing expectations from individuals, organizations, and government. This to the point that today the "Georgetown Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study" appears to be a study in total disregard for twenty plus years of work by hundreds of individuals from GU and the Georgetown community that fully expected GU to have a boathouse that would be an asset for the greater good of the local community.

I would hope that NPS does commit to the development of more boathouses in the area of the new waterfront park between Washington Harbor and Key Bridge as well as west of Key Bridge, the Washington Canoe Club, and the designated, already planned site of the Georgetown University boathouse. Please don't narrow the scope and size of the available space for boathouses by taking away the earlier space that the NPS, GU, and the Georgetown community believed to be appropriate for a Georgetown University boathouse.

Thank you in advance for your serious consideration of my comments on your project.

Sincerely,
John Forster

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 287

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Tom Fairfield
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 251 Fern Ridge
Landenberg, PA 19350
USA
E-mail: Tom.Fairfield@capmark.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/28/2013 Date Received: 05/28/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: E-mail

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Ms. Stidham,

Although I understand that the formal comment period on the above feasibility study may be closed, but since I learned about it only very recently, I wanted to send along a quick note anyway. I attended Georgetown University from 1976-1980 and was a member of the rowing team during that time as well as a coach in 1983. I also did some rowing at Potomac Boat Club. I have also attended numerous rowing events on the Potomac since then.

Based on my significant personal experience with rowing on the Potomac River, I fully support the establishment of a Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone as envisioned by the feasibility study as soon as possible. I believe that such a zone will help to ensure long-term dedication of this portion of the Potomac River to recreational activities that are (1) low impact from an environmental point of view, (2) consistent with the recreational activities in the parkland along the Potomac as well as the C&O Canal towpath, (3) will help to prevent the use of the waterfront for higher intensity commercial uses, and (4) will enhance the aesthetic, cultural and community benefits of this part of the Potomac shoreline. These benefits are even more obvious and important today than when I attended Georgetown as the development of the eastern shore of the Potomac north of Thompson's Boat center has progressed.

I like all sites (A, C, D and E) indicated in the Feasibility Study for rowing boathouses. I support designating the Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone and proceeding as quickly as possible to designate sites for Georgetown University and George Washington University. I believe that more study after 8 prior studies and 30 years would be unwarranted.

Best regards,

Thomas L. Fairfield

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 288

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Hank McEntee
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3606 Roberts Lane
Arlington, VA 22207
USA
E-mail: hankmac77@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/24/2013 Date Received: 05/24/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No

Type: E-mail

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Ms. Tammy Stidham
National Capital Region
National Park Service
Washington, DC
via email tammy_stidham@nps.gov

Re: Public/Stakeholder Comment on Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study (dated April 2013)

Dear Ms. Stidham:

The following comments are given to support the various sites being considered for the NMBZ:

I am writing today to say that approving these various sites for a new boathouse will provide opportunities for more schools and other users to participate in crew.

The existing number of boathouses do not provide enough capacity for all who want to pursue this sport.

During the past decade I have been privileged to be a part of a transformative process. As a coach for Bethesda-Chevy Chase Crew, a local public school, I have assisted hundreds of youthful eighth graders as they change into self confident young adults, capable of great feats of endurance and strength that rowing requires. A good deal of the credit for this growth in character goes to the sport, where life lessons are learned: your success in crew as in life, depends on hard work-- and lots of it. Talk with any one of these students or their families and you will hear the resounding impact rowing continues to have in their life. Approving a boathouse site will provide opportunities for more schools to offer this sport.

I have seen similar growth in the cancer survivors that I have had the honor of coaching at Potomac Boat Club. These women, who have had a life threatening illness, challenge themselves in what is for many of them, an entirely new activity. They often find new confidence from their accomplishments and health benefits. For some of these women, putting oars into water amounts to a new lease on life. Since Potomac Boat Club and Thompson's are at capacity, there is little chance for additional groups like this to get on the water without additional boathouses.

During the four decades that I myself have had the pleasure of rowing on the Potomac, I witnessed the shores of the Potomac in Georgetown as they changed from a wasteland of derelict factories and parking lots into a verdant park which gives bikers and pedestrians the option to get close to the asset that is the Potomac River. What I have not seen during this long period is the granting of more opportunity for rowers and paddlers to put their oars /paddles into the water. Commercial ventures like the Washington Harbor have gotten access. An admittedly beautiful and visitor friendly foreign embassy was added to the shoreline. But no new boathouse has appeared. Two local universities, with long histories of putting young men and women on the Potomac, are ready to build boat houses. Multiple studies have been made of the issue of cite selection, but no permission has been granted.

I strongly urge you to give more people the access to the benefits of the Potomac River by approving all of the possible boathouse sites.

Sincerely,

Hank McEntee

--

3606 Roberts Lane
Arlington, VA 22207

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 289**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Walter Groszyk
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: not provided
not provided, UN 000000000
USA
E-mail: wg@outcomesmatter.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/21/2013 Date Received: 05/21/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Walter Groszyk Comments.

Development of Site A:

The NPS should consider an alternative that moves the Washington Canoe Club building to Site A, particularly if: a.) the cost of stabilizing and reconstructing the existing building are substantial; and, b.) a new foundation is critical to protecting the building's integrity during future floods. (If NPS can move buildings on national parkland, surely it can do so for a structure that is merely on the National Register.) Moving the Canoe Club building might also allow Site B to be configured in a way that supports better vehicle access to Site A, as well as a future launching site for canoes, kayaks, etc.

Off-site parking for Development Scenarios #1 and #2.

The NPS should identify the number and location (proximity) of off-street parking spaces that would potentially be available to users of the boathouse and launching facilities that could be constructed in these two scenarios. The NPS should examine whether the availability of future parking would limit the number of users, particularly non-institutional, recreational users.

Future Space Availability at Thompson's Boat House under Development Scenarios #1 and #2.

The NPS should estimate how much storage space for sculls would become available at Thompson's Boat House if current users of that facility move to new boathouses in the Key Bridge boathouse zone.

The study should also describe potential effects on boathouse demand if one or more boathouses are built on the Virginia side of the Potomac River.

Flood Zone and a reconstructed Washington Canoe Club

On p. 27, the study notes that 'This flood hazard zone requires that the first habitable floor of a structure be constructed 1.5 feet above the 100-year flood elevation.' The NPS should describe the effect of this provision on the reconstructed Washington Canoe Club building.

Inefficient utilization of riverfront building space for storage of sculls.

The number of sculls in the inventory of the two university rowing teams far exceeds the number needed to support the crews rowing in any year. It would seem that the majority of these sculls are in dead storage. The NPS and the universities should examine the feasibility of storing sculls at a location outside the immediate riverfront. Such off-site storage could affect total building size, and building footprints on Sites D and E.

The Whitehurst Freeway:

On p.19, the study notes:

"Whitehurst Freeway is another elevated roadway directly above Water Street, NW. This freeway connects Key Bridge with roads to the east. Its support posts must be considered in any plans to develop new facilities east of Key Bridge because these posts would affect parking and turnaround configurations for boat trailers. Similar to Key Bridge, any development located adjacent to Whitehurst Freeway must be set back 25 feet to facilitate maintenance, creating a more narrow developable area immediately adjacent to the water. At one point, there were plans to remove Whitehurst Freeway, but these plans have been delayed indefinitely."

Comment: The alternatives for tearing down the Whitehurst and replacing it with a surface street would have exacerbated traffic conditions in the boathouse zone. The alternatives called for a four lane ramp starting from about 34th St and connecting Canal Road with the new surface street. On either side of the ramp was a traffic lane. Because of the columns supporting the ramp, the ability to turn a boat trailer was limited.

The future storm water retention tunnel.

WASA should provide the NPS with information on possible drop shafts to be constructed for two combined sewer overflow points located to the west of Site A, and a consequent need to use the Capital Crescent trail to build and access these drop shafts.

Utilities.

On p. 40, the study notes, "These easements include an easement for the Dulles Interceptor that runs beneath the Washington Canoe Club and easements on both sides of the Capital Crescent Trail for the Upper Potomac Interceptor and another 48-inch pipe."

Comment: There are not three sewers. The Upper Potomac Interceptor is the 48 inch sewer that is in fragile condition. The Dulles Interceptor is the larger diameter of the two sewers.

A characterization on one of the maps that the Upper Potomac interceptor is "inactive" may not be quite true. This sewer suffered a failure in 2012 west of Site A, and raw sewage overflowed the Capital Crescent trail and down to the river. The trail itself was undermined. Both the sewer and the trail were repaired in 2013.

There is a small outfall pipe (perhaps 12 inches in diameter) in to the Potomac at the east boundary of Site E. I do not

know the source of the flow from this pipe. The study should note the existence of this outfall on Site E.

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 53024
Correspondence: 290

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Nancy Long
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: not provided
not provided, UN 00000
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 05/30/2013 Date Received: 05/30/2013
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Other
Notes:

Correspondence Text

- Scenario 3 is the best choice for C&O Canal and Georgetown Waterfront Park

PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565
Correspondence: 102

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert Norris
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3901 Cathedral Ave VW
Washington, DC 20016
USA

E-mail: bob.norris@Inf.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 01/26/2012 Date Received: 01/26/2012
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Robert B. Norris
3901 Cathedral Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20016
(202) 333-3925

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

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

Dear Mr. May: January 26, 2012 In announcing the above-referenced Feasibility Study, the National Park Service stated that it will examine (1) "What facilities and uses can be accommodated in the zone?" and (2) "How many facilities can be accommodated, and where might they be placed?" It is my intention in this letter to provide workable and compelling answers to these questions. The proposed non-motorized boathouse zone "includes the waterfront land from immediately upstream of the Georgetown Waterfront Park at 341h St., to approximately 1,200 ft. upstream of the Key Bridge", a site immediately upstream from the Washington Canoe Club. While the Study seems to suggest that there are four sites within this zone, only three are acceptable. For the three remaining sites, there happen to be three obvious stakeholders: George Washington University, Georgetown University and Jack's.

With respect to the unacceptable site, the Park Service should, once and for all, deep six the upstream site originally proposed for Georgetown University's boathouse in the 2006 Environmental Assessment. This site, about 1,200 ft. inside the C&O Canal NHP, is near the entrance to the Capital Crescent Trail. It is environmentally unacceptable for potential development and should be rejected. The public's use and enjoyment of this treasured but already congested area would be preserved. This site should remain untouched and the historic and scenic features of the C&O Canal NHP would be protected. Based on numerous and well documented environmental, health and safety concerns, there was overwhelming opposition to this site during the above-mentioned EA process. Also, in its advisory role regarding specific matters related to the park, the C&O Canal Advisory Commission repeatedly rejected this site for a boathouse.

Of the three remaining sites, George Washington University has been promised the site located between 34th St. and Key Bridge. To advance its claim, GW purchased two of the three townhouses (3524 and 3526 K St.) which GW intends to convey to the Park Service in exchange for this site.

The Park Service and Georgetown University should give serious consideration to locating the Georgetown University boathouse on the site commonly referred to as "Jack's." This site is the area between Key Bridge and the Potomac Boat Club and includes the three town houses. With respect to the town houses, the Park Service will acquire the first two (3524 and 3526 Water St.) from George Washington University in exchange for GW's boathouse site between Key Bridge and 34th St. As things stand now, the Park Service intends to purchase the third town house (3528 Water St.) which is currently owned by "3528 K St. Associates LP". The Park Service would then have the town houses razed as they are considered inappropriate for that location anyway. Of course, in order to acquire this property from the Park Service, Georgetown University would exchange its upriver parcel and its mile-long easement over the Capital Crescent Trail.

During the aborted EIS process, Alan Harwood, a consultant with EDAW, estimated the length of Jack's site along the river at 200ft., along Water St. at 230 ft., and the depth from the street to the river about 100 ft. Actually, the useable space at this site exceeds Mr. Harwood's estimate. Nevertheless, if the average length of this site is about 215ft., the square footage of Jack's site is approximately 21,500 sq. ft. Since the Park Service intends to limit the footprint of Georgetown University's boathouse wherever it may ultimately be located to no more than 15,000 sq. ft., there is obviously more than ample space at Jack's site to accommodate all of the University's needs associated with its rowing program, including an interior rowing tank. Surely the University's architect can design such a boathouse for this site. Parenthetically, the planned boathouse for GW has a footprint of about 13,500 sq. ft. and it too will have a rowing tank.

There are many advantages for locating GU's boathouse at this site. This site is within the non-motorized boathouse zone but outside the C&O Canal NHP. This site, unlike sites within the Park, would not adversely impact the historic and scenic features of the C&O Canal. Even with a footprint of 15,000 sq. ft., a boathouse in the C&O Canal Park at the old EA site would dwarf its next door neighbor, the historic Washington Canoe Club. Also, there would be no height restrictions on the boathouse at this site. And, since the site fronts on Water St., unlike any proposed site within the Park, it is easily accessible with no requirement for a vehicular turnaround. This location would also avoid the safety problems inherent in the congestion at the somewhat narrow gateway of the Capital Crescent Trail which is used by hundreds of bikers and hikers every day of the year. And finally, this site poses no environmental concerns. But most important, the selection of this site will have wide public support.

A brief word about the future of Jack's Boathouse, a long-time popular venue. It should be moved to the site located adjacent to the Aqueduct Bridge, known as the Dempsey site. It would be easy to move the small office building currently located in the parking lot. Jack's rental operation consists ostensibly of floating docks strung together on which kayaks and canoes are stacked. Thus, moving Jack's operation to this site would result in only a minor inconvenience. By placing Jack's next to the Washington Canoe Club, there would be the additional benefit of grouping like uses (paddlers) side by side on the waterfront. By the same token, to place Georgetown University's boathouse at the former Jack's site would locate the University's boathouse between GW and the Potomac Boat Club, again grouping like uses (rowers) together.

The adoption of the recommendations contained in this letter would "cluster" GW's boathouse, Georgetown University's boathouse and the Potomac Boat Club, thereby creating a "boathouse row" around the commanding presence of Key Bridge. As an additional inducement for this proposal, the high school rowing programs would also benefit. Since Georgetown and GW would vacate the Thompson Boat Center, it would reduce substantially the currently overcrowded conditions in that facility. And, as a gesture of community good will, Georgetown and GW might consider allowing some of the high school rowing programs the use of their facilities on a time and space availability basis.

Since the boathouses for both GW and Georgetown University, as well as the relocation of Jack's boathouse, must be approved environmentally after the preparation of either an EIS or an EA, the projects could be considered together, thereby avoiding a duplication of effort and expense. I hope these recommendations will be useful to you in the ongoing Feasibility Study. In order to promote transparency, I am also submitting this letter as a comment to be posted on the project website.

Sincerely yours,
Robert B. Norris

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565
Correspondence: 103**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Robert Norris
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 3901 Cathedral Ave NW
Washington, DC 20016
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 01/26/2012 Date Received: 01/26/2012
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail
Notes:

Correspondence Text

May I suggest that you explain to the decision-maker that publication of comments as they are submitted promotes transparency, dialogue and understanding. It also ensures a better final resolution. Attached is a copy of a piece I wrote for the current. Please file it as an additional comment from me. If you can circulate it to the public that would be fine with me. I have no privacy problem. All the best.

Bob

Bob Norris

Licensed Realtor in D.C. and MD

Direct: 202-333-3925

Cell: 410-279-2881

E-mail: Bob.Norris@Inf.com

Finding a solution for all boathouse interests

VIEWPOINT

ROBERT NORRIS

In announcing a feasibility study to implement a non-motorized boathouse zone along the Georgetown waterfront from 34th Street to a site immediately upstream of the Washington Canoe Club, the National Park Service stated that it will examine two questions: "What facilities and uses can be accommodated in the zone?" and "How many facilities can be accommodated, and where might they be placed?"

It is my intention in this Viewpoint to provide workable and compelling answers to these questions. While there appear to be four possible sites within this zone, only three are acceptable. For these sites, there are three obvious stakeholders: George Washington University, Georgetown University and Jack's Boathouse.

The Park Service should, once and for all, deep-six the upstream site originally proposed for Georgetown University's boathouse in the 2006 environmental assessment. This site is located inside the C&O Canal National Historical Park near the entrance to the Capital Crescent Trail. The public's use and enjoyment of this treasured but congested area should be preserved and the historic and scenic features of the park protected. The C&O Canal Advisory Commission repeatedly rejected this site for a boathouse. Based on many well-documented concerns, there was significant opposition to this site during the 2006 review process.

Of the three remaining possibilities, George Washington University has been promised the site located between 34th Street and Key Bridge. To advance its claim, the university purchased two nearby town houses that it intends to convey to the Park Service in exchange for this site.

Georgetown University's boathouse should be located on the site commonly referred to as "Jack's." This site is between Key Bridge and the Potomac Boat Club and includes the town houses noted above. In order to acquire this property from the Park Service, Georgetown University would exchange its upriver parcel and its mile-long easement over the Capital Crescent Trail.

The estimated length of the Jack's site is 200 feet along the river and 230 feet along Water Street; the depth from the street to the river is about 100 feet. The square footage is roughly 21,500. Thus, there is obviously ample space at this site to accommodate all of the

university's needs associated with its rowing program, including an interior rowing tank. (The proposed boathouse for George Washington University has a footprint of about 13,500 square feet, and it, too, will have a rowing tank.)

There are many advantages for locating Georgetown University's boathouse at this location, which is within the non-motorized boathouse zone but outside the C&O Canal Park. Unlike sites within the park, it would not adversely impact the historic and scenic features of the canal. Also, there would be

fewer height restrictions on the boathouse at this location. And since the site fronts on Water Street (unlike any proposed site within the park), it is easily accessible, with no requirement for a vehicular turnaround. This location would also avoid safety problems inherent at the

narrow gateway of the busy Capital Crescent Trail. And finally, this site poses no environmental concerns. But most important, the selection of this site should have wide public support.

Jack's Boathouse, a longtime popular venue, should be moved to the area adjacent to the Aqueduct Bridge, known as the Dempsey site. It would be easy to move the small office building currently located in the parking lot. Jack's rental operation consists ostensibly of floating docks strung together on which kayaks and canoes are stacked. Thus, moving the Jack's operation to the Dempsey site would result in only a minor inconvenience.

The adoption of this proposal would "cluster" the two university boathouses and the Potomac Boat Club, thereby creating a "boathouse row" around the commanding presence of Key Bridge — an aesthetic plus. In addition, the high school rowing programs would benefit since the two universities would vacate the Thompson Boat Center, reducing the overcrowded conditions in that facility and providing more space for the high schools.

The university boathouses and relocation of Jack's Boathouse must be approved environmentally after the preparation of either an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment, but the projects could be considered together, avoiding a duplication of effort and expense.

I hope the community and especially the stakeholders and the Park Service will embrace these recommendations. The acceptance of this proposal would finally provide that elusive light at the end of the tunnel.

Robert Norris is a Cathedral Heights resident.

