



**Anacostia Park
Wetlands Restoration Plan with Goose
Management Strategies Plan/EA**

Public Comment Analysis Report

August 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Table of Contents</i>	2
<i>Introduction.....</i>	4
<i>The comment analysis process.....</i>	4
<i>Definition of Terms</i>	5
<i>Guide to This Document</i>	5
Content Analysis Report	7
Comment Distribution by Code	7
<i>Correspondence Distribution by Correspondence Type</i>	8
<i>Correspondence Distribution by Organization Type</i>	8
<i>Correspondence Distribution by State.....</i>	8
Anacostia Park Wetlands Restoration Plan with Resident Canada Goose Management Strategies Environmental Assessment Public Scoping Brochure Concern Response Report	9
<i>PSAC001 - Support lethal control of goose population</i>	9
<i>PSAC010 - Oppose lethal control of goose population</i>	9
<i>PSAC020 - Oppose eliminating entire population of geese.....</i>	9
<i>PSAC025 - Support eliminating entire population of geese.....</i>	9
<i>PSAC030 - Timing of actions</i>	10
<i>PSAC040 - Support egg addling.....</i>	10
<i>PSAC050 - Oppose egg addling as stand alone alternative.....</i>	10
<i>PSAC055 - Oppose capture and relocation of geese</i>	10
<i>PSAC060 - Contraception.....</i>	10
<i>PSAC070 - Support use of repellants</i>	11
<i>PSAC080 - Supports donation of goose carcasses.....</i>	11
<i>PSAC090 - Supports habitat modification</i>	11
<i>PSAC095 - Oppose habitat modification.....</i>	11
<i>PSAC100 - Support site aversion: dogs.....</i>	12
<i>PSAC105 - Support site aversion techniques: birds of prey.....</i>	12
<i>PSAC115 - Support fencing as management tool.....</i>	12
<i>PSAC120 - Oppose long-term fencing as a solution</i>	12
<i>PSAC130 - Engage and Educate Community</i>	13
<i>PSAC140 - Other Plans</i>	13
<i>PSAC150 - Humane approach</i>	13
<i>PSAC160 - Support adaptive management.....</i>	13
<i>PSAC170 - Support multi-faceted management and restoration plan</i>	13
<i>PSAC180 - Invasive plant species management</i>	14
<i>PSAE001 - Agriculture</i>	14
<i>PSAE010 - Wetland restoration</i>	14
<i>PSAE020 - Water Quality</i>	15
<i>PSAE030 - Native plant and animal species.....</i>	15
<i>PSAE035 - Community Cohesion</i>	15
<i>PSAE040 - Wetland functions</i>	15
<i>PSAE050 - Current Land Use/Management</i>	15
<i>PSCA001 - Non-geese impacts on water quality</i>	16
<i>PSCA010 - Other stressors on restored wetlands</i>	16
<i>PSCA020 - Current and future land-use</i>	16

<i>PSCC001 - Governmental</i>	16
<i>PSCC010 - Non-governmental</i>	17
<i>PSHS001 - Impacts on human health</i>	17
<i>PSHS010 - Donation of Carcasses</i>	17
<i>PSPN001 - Scope of plan</i>	17
<i>PSPN005 - Location for marsh restoration action</i>	18
<i>PSPN010 - NPS Plan needs EIS</i>	18
<i>PSPN015 - NPS Policy</i>	18
<i>PSPN030 - Public Participation: Mailing list</i>	18
<i>PSSM001 - Scientific data must support action taken</i>	19
<i>PSSM010 - Zero case scenario</i>	19
<i>PSVE001 - Goose impacts</i>	19
<i>Correspondence Index of Organizations</i>	20
<i>Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters</i>	21
<i>Index by Organization Type</i>	22
<i>Index by Code</i>	25

Introduction

On June 25, 2007 Anacostia Park released the Public Scoping Brochure for the Wetlands Restoration Plan/EA with Resident Canada Goose Management Strategies for public review and comment. The public was invited to submit comments on the scope of the planning process and potential alternatives through August 10, 2007. During the scoping period, two public scoping workshops were held. Both meetings were held at the U.S. Park Police Headquarters in Anacostia Park on July 17 and 18, 2007. Both workshops presented information about current Anacostia Park wetlands restoration and resident Canada Goose Management Strategies and the planning process for and Environmental Assessment. Park staff and other National Park Service (NPS) specialists were on hand to answer questions and provide additional information to workshop participants. During the scoping period, forty pieces of correspondence were entered into the Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) system either from direct entry by the commenter, or uploading of emails, faxes, and hard copy letters by NPS staff.

The comment analysis process

Comment analysis is a process used to compile and correlate similar public comments into a format that can be used by decision makers and the Wetlands Restoration Plan/EIS with Resident Canada Goose Management Strategies team. Comment analysis assists the team in organizing, clarifying, and addressing technical information pursuant to *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) regulations. It also aids in identifying the topics and issues to be evaluated and considered throughout the planning process.

The process includes five main components:

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

A coding structure was developed to help sort comments into logical groups by topics and issues. The coding structure was derived from an analysis of the range of topics discussed during internal NPS scoping, past planning documents, and the comments themselves. The coding structure was designed to capture all comment content rather than to restrict or exclude any ideas.

The NPS PEPC database was used for management of the comments. The database stores the full text of all correspondence and allows each comment to be coded by topic and issue. Some outputs from the database include tallies of the total number of correspondences and comments received, sorting and reporting of comments by a particular topic or issue, and demographic information regarding the sources of the comments.

Analysis of the public comments involved the assignment of the codes to statements made by the public in their letters, email messages, and written comment forms. All comments were read and analyzed, including those of a technical nature; opinions, feelings, and preferences of one element or one potential alternative over another; and comments of a personal or philosophical nature.

Although the analysis process attempts to capture the full range of public concerns, this content analysis report should be used with caution. Comments from people who chose to respond do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the entire public. Furthermore, this was not a vote-counting process, and the emphasis was on the content of the comment rather than the number of times a comment was received.

Definition of Terms

Primary terms used in the document are defined below.

Correspondence: A correspondence is the entire document received from a commenter. It can be in the form of a letter, email, written comment form, note card, open house transcript, or petition.

Comment: A comment is a portion of the text within a correspondence that addresses a single subject. It could include such information as an expression of support or opposition to the use of a potential management tool, additional data regarding the existing condition, or an opinion debating the adequacy of an analysis.

Code: A grouping centered on a common subject. The codes were developed during the scoping process and are used to track major subjects throughout the EIS process.

Concern: Concerns are subdivisions of codes. Each code was further separated into several concern statements to provide a better focus on the content of comments. In cases where no comments were received on an issue, the issue was not identified or discussed in this report.

Guide to This Document

This report is organized as follows:

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

Public Scoping Comment Summary- This report summarizes the substantive comments received during the scoping process. These comments are organized by codes and further organized into concern statements. Below each concern statement are representative quotes, which have been taken directly from the text of the public's comments and further clarify the concern statements.

Correspondence Index of Organizations- This provides a listing of all groups that submitted comments, arranged and grouped by the following organization types as defined by PEPC (and in this order): businesses; churches and religious groups; civic groups, conservation/preservation groups; federal government; NPS employees; non-governmental groups; recreational groups; state government; town or city government;

tribal government; unaffiliated individuals; university/professional society. Each piece of correspondence was assigned a unique identification number upon entry into PEPC. This number can be used to assist the public in identifying the way NPS addressed their comments.

Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters- This provides a listing of all of the individuals who submitted comments during the public scoping period. Like the previous index, each correspondence was assigned a unique identification number which can be used to assist individuals in identifying the way in which NPS addressed their comments. This list is organized alphabetically.

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

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

Content Analysis Report

Comment Distribution by Code

Code	Description	# of Comments
PSAC001	Support lethal control of goose population	15
PSAC010	Oppose lethal control of goose population	15
PSAC020	Oppose eliminating entire population of geese	2
PSAC025	Support eliminating entire population of geese	1
PSAC030	Timing of actions	10
PSAC040	Support egg addling	11
PSAC050	Oppose egg addling as stand alone alternative	1
PSAC055	Oppose capture and relocation of geese	1
PSAC060	Contraception	1
PSAC070	Support use of repellants	2
PSAC080	Supports donation of goose carcasses	8
PSAC090	Supports habitat modification	5
PSAC095	Oppose habitat modification	1
PSAC100	Support site aversion: dogs	9
PSAC105	Support site aversion techniques: birds of prey	2
PSAC110	Oppose site aversion techniques	0
PSAC115	Support fencing as management tool	5
PSAC120	Oppose long-term fencing as a solution	4
PSAC130	Engage and Educate Community	4
PSAC140	Other Plans	11
PSAC150	Humane approach	6
PSAC160	Support adaptive management	2
PSAC170	Support multi-faceted management and restoration plan	4
PSAC180	Invasive plant species management	1
PSAE001	Agriculture	1
PSAE010	wetland restoration	14
PSAE020	Water Quality	8
PSAE030	Native plant and animal species	8
PSAE035	Community Cohesion	4
PSAE040	Wetland functions	6
PSAE050	Current Land Use/Management	3
PSCA001	Non-geese impacts on water quality	2
PSCA010	Other stressors on restored wetlands	3
PSCA020	Current and future land-use	6
PSCC001	Governmental	9
PSCC010	Non-governmental	10
PSHS001	Impacts on human health	11
PSHS010	Donation of Carcasses	1
PSPN001	Scope of plan	27
PSPN005	Location for marsh restoration action	5
PSPN010	NPS Plan needs EIS	1
PSPN015	NPS Policy	2
PSPN030	Public Participation: Mailing list	2
PSSM001	Scientific data must support action taken	7
PSSM010	Zero case scenario	2
PSVE001	Goose impacts	6

Correspondence Distribution by Correspondence Type

Type	Number of Correspondences
Web Form	25
Park Form	1
Letter	13
Transcript	9
E-mail	1
Total	49

Correspondence Distribution by Organization Type

Organization Type	Number of Correspondences
Town or City Government	1
Business	2
Federal Government	1
NPS Employee	1
Conservation/Preservation	12
Non-Governmental	4
State Government	1
Unaffiliated Individual	27
Total	49

Correspondence Distribution by State

State	Percentage	Number of Correspondences
VA	8.16%	4
MD	28.57%	14
DC	20.41%	10
NY	2.04%	1
Other	40.82%	20
Total	100%	49

Anacostia Park
Wetlands Restoration Plan with Resident Canada Goose Management
Strategies Environmental Assessment
Public Scoping Brochure
Concern Response Report

PSAC001 - Support lethal control of goose population

Concern ID: 14649

CONCERN [Comments support lethal control of resident Canada goose population.](#)

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 6 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61564 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to support the use of lethal measures to control resident Canadian geese populations

PSAC010 - Oppose lethal control of goose population

Concern ID: 14650

CONCERN [Comments oppose lethal control of resident Canada goose population.](#)

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30 **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States

Comment ID: 61512 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The HSUS, as part of the animal welfare and protection community, has a long history of involvement with resolution of conflicts between people and wild birds and for many years has promoted community-based conflict resolution strategies founded on the strongly held belief that it is unnecessary to kill wild geese and other birds to resolve conflicts.

PSAC020 - Oppose eliminating entire population of geese

Concern ID: 14651

CONCERN [Comments oppose eliminating entire population of resident Canada geese.](#)

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 5 **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society

Comment ID: 61616 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: AWS is not in favor of getting rid of every last goose in Anacostia Park.

PSAC025 - Support eliminating entire population of geese

Concern ID: 14652

CONCERN [Comments support eliminating entire population of resident Canada geese.](#)

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 8 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61556 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Serious consideration needs to be given to eliminating the entire population in order to reintroduce the marshland and the native population of fowl and wildlife.

PSAC030 - Timing of actions

Concern ID: 14653

CONCERN Comments state preferred/recommended timing for certain actions.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 36

Organization: GeesePeace

Comment ID: 61589

Organization Type: Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: Geese nests in the wetlands area will be taken down approximately two weeks after the mother goose has laid all her eggs to facilitate an early molt migration.

PSAC040 - Support egg addling

Concern ID: 14654

CONCERN Comments support egg addling as part of management plan.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 38

Organization: GeesePeace

Comment ID: 61501

Organization Type: Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: We recommend egg oiling. We have a protocol for this that is effective and non-controversial.

PSAC050 - Oppose egg addling as stand alone alternative

Concern ID: 14655

CONCERN Comments oppose egg addling as viable stand-alone alternative for population management.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 5

Organization: Anacostia Watershed Society

Comment ID: 61495

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Reproductive control (e.g., egg treatment or sterilization) alone cannot reduce the population in an acceptable time: treatment of 95% of all eggs each year would result in only a 25% reduction over 10 years." (Canada Goose Committee, Atlantic Flyway Council).

PSAC055 - Oppose capture and relocation of geese

Concern ID: 14823

CONCERN Comments oppose capture and relocation of geese as a viable option.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 43

Organization: MD Ornithological Society

Comment ID: 61792

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Capturing and relocation not feasible

PSAC060 - Contraception

Concern ID: 14656

CONCERN Comments consider contraception to be an option worthy of analysis.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30

Organization: The Humane Society of the United States

Comment ID: 61527

Organization Type: Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: In addition to egg oiling and/or removal, a new contraceptive is registered by the US Environmental Protection Agency for Canada geese. The option of including this tool in an integrated program must be analyzed.

PSAC070 - Support use of repellants

Concern ID: 14657

CONCERN Comments support the use of repellants in goose management strategies.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 38

Organization: GeesePeace

Comment ID: 61499

Organization Type: Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: We recommend using "Flight Control", a goose repellent that gives geese a mild upset stomach so after awhile, they stop eating the grass. Flight Control has a "sticker" that keeps the repellent from washing off during wet conditions. It also has a visual marker that the geese can see so they know to not eat the grass where they see the marker.

PSAC080 - Supports donation of goose carcasses

Concern ID: 14658

CONCERN Comments propose the donation of goose carcasses.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 33

Organization: The First Tee of Washington, DC

Comment ID: 61486

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I fully support trapping and processing all unbanded geese at both locations. The homeless could benefit from the geese (as food) if this were done in late June or early July.

PSAC090 - Supports habitat modification

Concern ID: 14659

CONCERN Commenters feel that habitat modification should be part of management plan.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 9

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 61576

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Habitat modification works in many areas creating areas that are not manicured but have high grasses cutting visibility making the birds uneasy.

PSAC095 - Oppose habitat modification

Concern ID: 14660

CONCERN Commenters feel habitat modification is ineffective.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 33

Organization: The First Tee of Washington, DC

Comment ID: 61488

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Habitat modifications traditionally are really not that effective on golf courses.

PSAC100 - Support site aversion: dogs

Concern ID: 14661

CONCERN STATEMENT: Responders propose using dogs to encourage geese to migrate/move locations.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30

Organization: The Humane Society of the United States

Comment ID: 61528 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: Harassment with the most effective methods needs to be strongly and consistently applied. Well-trained and handled herding dogs are an excellent harassment tool. Dogs to harass away Canada geese have become commonplace on golf courses, in particular, because they are very effective although I am not aware that the golf course next to the artificial wetland site uses them. Once geese are conditions to fear dogs, they can also be effectively used to harass geese away from open water where the dogs can be taken in boats.

PSAC105 - Support site aversion techniques: birds of prey

Concern ID: 14662

CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments recommend using birds of prey to encourage geese to migrate/move locations.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 35

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61482 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Birds of prey such as trained falcons or hawks would also provide a way to remove the geese humanely. When a bird or flock of birds encounters falcons or hawks, they immediately flee in panic. Similar to the use of Border Collies, continued use of falcons or hawks would condition the geese to stay away from the park. The use of birds of prey has been highly successful in keeping flocks of birds away in large areas such as golf courses and airports.

PSAC115 - Support fencing as management tool

Concern ID: 14663

CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments support fencing as management tool and/or offer recommendations on fencing designs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 38

Organization: GeesePeace

Comment ID: 61496 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: We recommend continuation of the techniques you have already implemented. i.e. placing overhead wires with reflective tape.

PSAC120 - Oppose long-term fencing as a solution

Concern ID: 14664

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters feel fencing is not a viable solution.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 5

Organization: Anacostia Watershed Society

Comment ID: 61494 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Fencing is not a viable, long-term solution to goose herbivory because it blocks other fauna from food, cover, and nesting sites. It also requires ongoing maintenance (labor intensive), and is has aesthetic drawbacks in a natural area.

PSAC130 - Engage and Educate Community

Concern ID: 14665

CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments propose education and community engagement as part of management plan.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 26

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61570 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: People can be educated---and should be---on why NOT to feed the geese. This can be as simple as posting little educational signs along any body of water or pathway. And actually, not feeding them is better for them in the long run. People don't understand. HSUS could also help you in this area.

PSAC140 - Other Plans

Concern ID: 14666

CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments suggest other plans or programs that NPS should evaluate while developing its plan.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 13

Organization: Save The Geese

Comment ID: 61546 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: Utilizing the GeesePeace method encompasses egg oiling, hazing with border collies and simple maintenance.

PSAC150 - Humane approach

Concern ID: 14667

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support a humane, non-lethal approach to goose management.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 23

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61538 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I hope that you and the planning board will consider more humane options for dealing with the geese problem, such as the Geese Peace program which has enjoyed significant success in the Northeastern States where it has been used.

PSAC160 - Support adaptive management

Concern ID: 14669

CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments encourage adaptive management approach be built into plan.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30

Organization: The Humane Society of the United States

Comment ID: 61522 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The program must then be applied consistently with adaptive changes as experience shows what works well and as new information and tools become available.

PSAC170 - Support multi-faceted management and restoration plan

Concern ID: 14668

CONCERN STATEMENT: Respondents encourage a manifold approach to wetland restoration and goose management.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 5

Organization: Anacostia Watershed Society

Comment ID: 61508 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: In particular, we ask you to develop a multi-faceted geese population control and wetlands protection and restoration plan.

PSAC180 - Invasive plant species management

Concern ID: 14670

CONCERN Comments discuss the management of invasive plant species.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 32 **Organization:** Capitol Hill Restoration Society

Comment ID: 61604 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: CHRS urges NPS to map and survey the Anacostia Park wetland areas and then take action to eliminate invasive trees, plants and vines.

PSAE001 - Agriculture

Concern ID: 14671

CONCERN Respondents express concern over impacts of resident Canada geese on local agriculture.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 17 **Organization:** Alice Ferguson Foundations, Inc.

Comment ID: 61561 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: The Alice Ferguson Foundation/Hard Bargain Farm Environmental Center conducts agricultural operations within Piscataway Park under a special use agreement with the National Park Service. For decades, our farmers have practiced successful crop rotation with a wide variety of plants that included soybeans, corn, wheat, rye, lespedeza, timothy and clover. Over the past 10 - 15 years, our ability to harvest these crops has been drastically reduced and in the past 5 years, we are only able to grow mediocre quality hay - no other crops. The Canada geese are present in Piscataway Park in great numbers in the spring when seeds germinate and send up green shoots. Geese descend en masse and obliterate nearly every seed that sprouts.

PSAE010 - Wetland restoration

Concern ID: 14672

CONCERN Comments encourage and suggest strategies for wetland restoration.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 14 **Organization:** USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center

Comment ID: 61610 **Organization Type:** Federal Government

Representative Quote: the current disposition for the wetland restoration is to deal with the existing status especially as set back by the presence of the over abundant resident Canada geese. However, consistent with the posture of restoring/sustaining the existing wetlands must also come direct support for re-establishing additional wetlands. This is vital and justified because to restore the existing wetlands there is the need for their well being to be interconnected. Thus the existing disparate pieces need to be at least connected if not supplemented with additional wetlands so that the Anacostia wetland complex can function as an integrated whole. The capacity for the Anacostia wetlands to serve as sufficient habitat will require the formation of a collectively functioning critical mass of diverse ecotypes, such that simply resurrecting the existing pieces is not the whole answer for restoring the Anacostia wetlands - not even sufficient for each of the wetland sites themselves.

PSAE020 - Water Quality

Concern ID: 14673

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Comments discuss potential impacts of geese on water quality.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3

Organization: AWCAC

Comment ID: 61550 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It was unclear to me if you recorded my comments on the increase in turbidity and TSS due to geese eating up the wetlands

PSAE030 - Native plant and animal species

Concern ID: 14674

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Comments discuss native plant and animal species that may be affected by plan.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 17

Organization: Alice Ferguson Foundations, Inc.

Comment ID: 61562 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: we have seen a species shift in the marsh at the mouth of the Accokeek Creek. Wild rice was one the dominate plant there. Now, we are lucky to have a total of 10 plants in the entire marsh.

PSAE035 - Community Cohesion

Concern ID: 14675

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Comments relate to the impact of killing geese on the community.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 13

Organization: Save The Geese

Comment ID: 61750 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: This will also result in a divided community - something nobody wants. Instead I suggest a win-win-win option

PSAE040 - Wetland functions

Concern ID: 14690

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Comments discuss impacts on wetland functions.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 5

Organization: Anacostia Watershed Society

Comment ID: 61761 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: "Herbivory by Resident Geese: The Loss and Recovery of Wild Rice Along the Tidal Patuxent River" by Haramis and Kearns. This article contributes to the body of evidence that the grazing patterns of nonmigratory geese are a setback to the ecological functioning of local freshwater tidal marshes.

PSAE050 - Current Land Use/Management

Concern ID: 14824

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Respondents discuss impacts of geese on current land use and/or management.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 42

Organization: Langston Golf Course

Comment ID: 61793 **Organization Type:** NPS Employee

Representative Quote: Goose feces are a problem on the greens Have to mow greens to remove it

PSCA001 - Non-geese impacts on water quality

Concern ID: 14676

CONCERN STATEMENT: Respondents consider other (non-geese) issues hindering wetland restoration.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 7

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61759 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do something to rid the Anacostia of human sewage before blaming the Geese for that mess. The Anacostia had been a cesspool long before the Geese arrived.

PSCA010 - Other stressors on restored wetlands

Concern ID: 14677

CONCERN STATEMENT: Respondents consider other (non-geese) issues hindering wetland restoration.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30

Organization: The Humane Society of the United States

Comment ID: 61517 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: Further, a reasonable and realistic assessment must be made of other processes that impede wetlands restoration, including an assessment of the adequacy of areas restored or planned for restoration to function in an ecologically sustainable manner.

PSCA020 - Current and future land-use

Concern ID: 14678

CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments implicate different land-use choices as inhibiting successful habitat preservation/restoration.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30

Organization: The Humane Society of the United States

Comment ID: 61519 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: It is simply not realistic to have the most goose-attractive land use possible but not have abundant geese flocking to that nirvana who then also take advantage of the very attractive food source (wetlands plants) placed next door.

PSCC001 - Governmental

Concern ID: 14679

CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments suggest coordination with specific or general government agencies.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30

Organization: The Humane Society of the United States

Comment ID: 61524 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: Since geese use a much wider geographic area than the limited artificial wetlands sites on the Anacostia River, this alternative needs to be defined to include working cooperatively with state and local governments (i.e. District of Columbia, Maryland, and Prince Georges' County), other federal agencies who manage land in the region, and managers and owners of private land the geese use. This scale is necessary to effectively address this flock's impact on the Parks' wetlands.

PSCC010 - Non-governmental

Concern ID: 14680

CONCERN STATEMENT: Respondents suggest collaboration with non-governmental organizations.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 26

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61572 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please call The Humane Society (HSUS) and Geesepeace. Invite them to your meeting explaining what it is you are dealing with. They will be more than happy to come out and help, talk about and explain the options, answer any questions etc. They are there to work with you in this.

PSHS001 - Impacts on human health

Concern ID: 14681

CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments discuss the null or negative effects of goose feces on human health and safety.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 20

Organization: Anacostia Watershed Society

Comment ID: 61749 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Resident Canada Geese pose a nuisance and, more seriously, a public health hazard around grass parks like golf courses and waterfront parks where the geese congregate in the same areas as humans. They defecate heavily and avoiding droppings becomes a concern.

Corr. ID: 36

Organization: GeesePeace

Comment ID: 61581 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The conclusion is that resident Canada geese do not pose a significant risk to human health.

PSHS010 - Donation of Carcasses

Concern ID: 14682

CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments discuss opinions about donation of goose carcasses.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 9

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61579 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: PLEASE, Mr. Syphax-NPS, these birds are living in the "polluted Anacostia River". If you as NPS are pushing these toxic birds on who?, the poor, as source of food, you need to rethink that idea real fast. Most resident geese are not even suited for food to zoos it is so toxic.

PSPN001 - Scope of plan

Concern ID: 14683

CONCERN STATEMENT: Respondents suggest geographical and temporal boundaries for the actions in the plan.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30

Organization: The Humane Society of the United States

Comment ID: 61516 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The Plan/EA should not limit analysis to only the sites of artificial wetlands on the Anacostia. Such a narrow geographic area will omit important aspects of the environment both impacting and impacted by the decisions this Plan/EA will be developing. Even the boundaries of Anacostia Park would be too limited. While the Plan/EA will necessarily focus on the Park, the analysis must extend to encompass the range used by the Canada goose flock who forage at the Park.

PSPN005 - Location for marsh restoration action

Concern ID: 14684
CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments pertain specifically to marsh restoration and either question the viability of restoration sites, suggest new sites or suggest changes to existing sites.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30 **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States
Comment ID: 61531 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental
Representative Quote: A more appropriate location for the specific type of low-elevation wetland that failed at Kingman could be sought. The problematic Kingman site could be re-engineered at a higher elevation with a different plant mix less attractive to geese and more resilient when browsed.

PSPN010 - NPS Plan needs EIS

Concern ID: 14685
CONCERN STATEMENT: Respondents articulate the opinion that planning process should involve an EIS.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30 **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States
Comment ID: 61515 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental
Representative Quote: We believe these issues to be compelling enough that if NPS is to move on this issue it must engage in a fully comprehensive environmental impact assessment aimed at producing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

PSPN015 - NPS Policy

Concern ID: 14686
CONCERN STATEMENT: Respondents question whether proposed actions are aligned with NPS policy.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30 **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States
Comment ID: 61514 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental
Representative Quote: It would also have to find that the proposed action is within the policy mandate of NPS and morally justifiable.

PSPN030 - Public Participation: Mailing list

Concern ID: 14825
CONCERN STATEMENT: Comments suggest additions to mailing list or sources of names and addresses
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 41 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 61820 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Reach out to community leaders, email may not be effective

PSSM001 - Scientific data must support action taken

Concern ID: 14687

CONCERN Commenters request a sound scientific basis for all actions taken

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 30

Organization: The Humane Society of the United States

Comment ID: 61513 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: We applaud the efforts of the National Parks Service (NPS) and their partners to restore viable and vital wetlands to the Anacostia River system. However, we would certainly question and object to NPS lethally reducing a native animal population for the benefit of that process. The Plan/EA must present impeccable scientific demonstrations of both the need to adopt this alternative and of the fact that no other alternative would suffice.

PSSM010 - Zero case scenario

Concern ID: 14688

CONCERN Comments specifically question including a baseline number of resident Canada geese in the Zero Case Scenario.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 39

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61612 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The zero point you use already includes a major population of non-migratory geese, but they are a perturbation which should be assumed absent in the base case.

PSVE001 - Goose impacts

Concern ID: 14689

CONCERN Respondents relate concerns about the impacts of geese on their and others' experience in the park.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 25

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 61537 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Those unavoidable feces are unpleasant to play in and attach themselves to shoes and golf cart wheels from which they are tracked into human habitations where they can be a health hazard.

Correspondence Index of Organizations

Correspondence ID	Organization	Name
Business		
46	Anacostia Waterfront Corporation	Shane, Brendan
10	Anacostia Waterfront Corporation	Shane, Edward B.
Conservation/Preservation		
17	Alice Ferguson Foundations, Inc.	Jensen Miles, Karen
5	Anacostia Watershed Society	McKindley-Ward, Steve
47	Anacostia Watershed Society	McKindley-Ward, Steve
3	AWCAC	Collier, James .
44	Earth Conservation Group	Van Wye, Brian
32	Capitol Hill Restoration Society	Wolf, Richard N.
43	MD Ornithological Society	N/A, N/A .
19	Natural Resources Defense Council	Stone, Nancy
40	Sierra Club	Luciano, Damon C.
37	Sierra Club	Martin, Michael
Federal Government		
14	USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center	Hammerschlag, Dick
Non-Governmental		
36	GeesePeace	Feld, David
38	GeesePeace	Feld, David
30	The Humane Society of the United States	Brasted, Maggie
18	Friends of Animals	Rice, Nancy
13	Save The Geese	Brown, Laura S.
NPS Employee		
42	Langston Golf Course	Davis, Dowell
State Government		
49	Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project	DiNicola, Patrick
Town or City Government		
48	Prince George's County	N/A, N/A

Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters

Name	Correspondence ID	Kept Private
Brandi, Jennifer	35	No
Brasted, Maggie	30	No
Brown, Laura S.	13	No
Collier, James	3	No
Davis, Dowell	42	No
DiNicola, Patrick	49	No
Feld, David	36	No
Feld, David	38	No
Flygar, Rita	15	No
Frankel, Richard	39	No
Garner, John M.	33	No
Hammerschlag, Dick	14	No
Hance, Ioana R.	27	No
Jensen Miles, Karen	17	No
Kept Private	4	Yes
Kept Private	8	Yes
Kept Private	22	Yes
Kept Private	26	Yes
Kept Private	21	Yes
Kept Private	6	Yes
Kept Private	9	Yes
Kept Private	11	Yes
Kept Private	7	Yes
Kept Private	23	Yes
Kept Private	12	Yes
Kept Private	1	Yes
Kept Private	2	Yes
Luciano, Damon C.	40	No
Martin, Michael	37	No
McKindley-Ward, Steve	5	No
McKindley-Ward, Steve	47	No
Mutu, Kamweti .	20	No
N/A, N/A .	29	No
N/A, N/A .	41	No
N/A, N/A .	43	No
N/A, N/A .	45	No
N/A, N/A .	48	No
Nelson, Carl .	25	No
Prouty, Perrie'Lee	16	No
Rice, Nancy	18	No
Rudy, Susan	31	No
Shane, Brendan	46	No
Shane, Edward B.	10	No
Stone, Nancy	19	No
Van Wye, Brian	44	No
Wolf, Richard N.	32	No
Woolridge, Susan	28	No

Index by Organization Type

Org. Type	Organization	Corr. ID	Code	Description
Business				
	Anacostia Waterfront Corporation	10	PSAC001	Support lethal control of goose population
			PSAC170	Support multi-faceted management and restoration plan
			PSAE020	Water Quality
		46	PSAE010	wetland restoration
			PSCA020	Current and future land-use
			PSPN001	Scope of plan
Conservation/Preservation				
	Alice Ferguson Foundations, Inc.	17	PSAC001	Support lethal control of goose population
	Anacostia Watershed Society	5	PSAC001	Support lethal control of goose population
			PSAC020	Oppose eliminating entire population of geese
			PSAC050	Oppose egg addling as stand alone alternative
			PSAC080	Supports donation of goose carcasses
			PSAC100	Support site aversion: dogs
			PSAC120	Oppose long-term fencing as a solution
			PSAC150	Humane approach
			PSAC170	Support multi-faceted management and restoration plan
			PSAE010	wetland restoration
			PSAE030	Native plant and animal species
			PSAE040	Wetland functions
			PSCC001	Governmental
			PSCC010	Non-governmental
			PSHS001	Impacts on human health
		20	PSAE040	Wetland functions
			PSHS001	Impacts on human health
			PSVE001	Goose impacts
		47	PSAC020	Oppose eliminating entire population of geese
			PSAC080	Supports donation of goose carcasses
			PSAC160	Support adaptive management
			PSAE010	wetland restoration
			PSAE030	Native plant and animal species
			PSCC001	Governmental
			PSPN001	Scope of plan
	Capitol Hill Restoration Society	32	PSAC180	Invasive plant species management
			PSAE010	Wetland restoration
	Earth Conservation Group	44	PSAC001	Support lethal control of goose population
			PSAE030	Native plant and animal species

	Friends of Animals	18	PSAC140	Other Plans
	MD Ornithological Society	43	PSAC001	Support lethal control of goose population
			PSAC055	Oppose capture and relocation of geese
			PSAC120	Oppose long-term fencing as a solution
	Natural Resources Defense Council	19	PSAC170	Support multi-faceted management and restoration plan
			PSAE040	Wetland functions
	Sierra Club	40	PSAC001	Support lethal control of goose population
			PSAC115	Support fencing as management tool
			PSAC120	Oppose long-term fencing as a solution
			PSAE010	Wetland restoration
			PSAE020	Water Quality
			PSAE030	Native plant and animal species
			PSAE040	Wetland functions
		37	PSAC001	Support lethal control of goose population
			PSPN001	Scope of plan
Federal Government				
	USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center	14	PSAE010	Wetland restoration
			PSCA010	Other stressors on restored wetlands
			PSCA020	Current and future land-use
			PSPN001	Scope of plan
			PSPN005	Location for marsh restoration action
Non-Governmental				
	GeesePeace	36	PSAC030	Timing of actions
			PSAC040	Support egg addling
			PSAC130	Engage and Educate Community
			PSAC140	Other Plans
			PSCA020	Current and future land-use
			PSCC001	Governmental
			PSCC010	Non-governmental
			PSHS001	Impacts on human health
			PSPN001	Scope of plan
		38	PSAC010	Oppose lethal control of goose population
			PSAC030	Timing of actions
			PSAC040	Support egg addling
			PSAC070	Support use of repellants
			PSAC115	Support fencing as management tool
			PSAC140	Other Plans
			PSPN001	Scope of plan
	Save The Geese	13	PSAC010	Oppose lethal control of goose population
			PSAC040	Support egg addling
			PSAC100	Support site aversion: dogs
			PSAC140	Other Plans

			PSAE035	Community Cohesion
	The Humane Society of the United States	30	PSAC010	Oppose lethal control of goose population.
			PSAC060	Contraception
			PSAC070	Support use of repellants
			PSAC100	Support site aversion: dogs
			PSAC140	Other Plans
			PSAC150	Humane approach
			PSAC160	Support adaptive management
			PSAE010	Wetland restoration
			PSCA010	Other stressors on restored wetlands
			PSCA02	Current and future land-use
			PSCC001	Governmental
			PSCC010	Non-governmental
			PSPN001	Scope of plan
			PSPN005	Location for marsh restoration action
			PSPN010	NPS Plan needs EIS
			PSPN015	NPS Policy
			PSSM001	Scientific data must support action taken
NPS Employee				
	Langston Golf Course	42	PSAC030	Timing of actions
			PSAC040	Support egg addling
			PSAE050	Current Land Use/Management
			PSHS001	Impacts on human health
			PSPN001	Scope of plan
State Government				
	Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project	49	PSAC090	Supports habitat modification
			PSAC115	Support fencing as management tool
			PSCC001	Governmental
Town or City Government				
	Prince George's County	48	PSCC001	Governmental

Index by Code

PSAC001 - Support lethal control of goose population

Alice Ferguson Foundations, Inc. - 17
Anacostia Waterfront Corporation - 10
Anacostia Watershed Society - 5
Earth Conservation Group - 44
MD Ornithological Society - 43
Sierra Club - 37 , 40
The First Tee of Washington, DC - 33
Unaffiliated Individual - 2 , 6 , 11 , 39 , 41

PSAC010 - Oppose lethal control of goose population

GeesePeace - 38
Save The Geese - 13
The Humane Society of the United States - 30
Unaffiliated Individual - 1 , 12 , 15 , 16 , 21 , 22 , 26 , 27 , 28 , 29 , 35

PSAC020 - Oppose eliminating entire population of geese

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5 , 47

PSAC025 - Support eliminating entire population of geese

Unaffiliated Individual - 8

PSAC030 - Timing of actions

GeesePeace - 36 , 38
Langston Golf Course - 42
Unaffiliated Individual - 8 , 39 , 41

PSAC040 - Support egg addling

GeesePeace - 36 , 38
Langston Golf Course - 42
Save The Geese - 13
Unaffiliated Individual - 26 , 28 , 41

PSAC050 - Oppose egg addling as stand alone alternative

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5

PSAC055 - Oppose capture and relocation of geese

MD Ornithological Society - 43

PSAC060 - Contraception

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

PSAC070 - Support use of repellants

GeesePeace - 38

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

PSAC080 - Supports donation of goose carcasses

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5 , 47

The First Tee of Washington, DC - 33

Unaffiliated Individual - 2 , 4 , 39 , 41

PSAC090 - Supports habitat modification

Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project - 49

Unaffiliated Individual - 9 , 12 , 26 , 31

PSAC095 - Oppose habitat modification

The First Tee of Washington, DC - 33

PSAC100 - Support site aversion: dogs

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5

Save The Geese - 13

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

Unaffiliated Individual - 7 , 9 , 16 , 35

PSAC105 - Support site aversion techniques: birds of prey

Unaffiliated Individual - 35

PSAC115 - Support fencing as management tool

GeesePeace - 38

Sierra Club - 40

Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project - 49

PSAC120 - Oppose long-term fencing as a solution

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5

MD Ornithological Society - 43

Sierra Club - 40

PSAC130 - Engage and Educate Community

GeesePeace - 36

Unaffiliated Individual - 16 , 26

PSAC140 - Other Plans

Friends of Animals - 18

GeesePeace - 36 , 38

Save The Geese - 13

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

Unaffiliated Individual - 1 , 27 , 28 , 41

PSAC150 - Humane approach

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

Unaffiliated Individual - 23 , 26 , 27 , 28

PSAC160 - Support adaptive management

Anacostia Watershed Society - 47

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

PSAC170 - Support multi-faceted management and restoration plan

Anacostia Waterfront Corporation - 10

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5

Natural Resources Defense Council - 19

Unaffiliated Individual - 2

PSAC180 - Invasive plant species management

Capitol Hill Restoration Society - 32

PSAE001 - Agriculture

Alice Ferguson Foundations, Inc. - 17

PSAE010 - wetland restoration

Anacostia Waterfront Corporation - 46

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5 , 47

Capitol Hill Restoration Society - 32

Sierra Club - 40

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 14

PSAE020 - Water Quality

AWCAC - 3

Anacostia Waterfront Corporation - 10

N/A - 45

Sierra Club - 40

Unaffiliated Individual - 2 , 6

PSAE030 - Native plant and animal species

Alice Ferguson Foundations, Inc. - 17

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5 , 47

Earth Conservation Group - 44

Sierra Club - 40

Unaffiliated Individual - 41

PSAE035 - Community Cohesion

Save The Geese - 13

Unaffiliated Individual - 26 , 27 , 28

PSAE040 - Wetland functions

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5 , 20

N/A - 45

Natural Resources Defense Council - 19

Sierra Club - 40

Unaffiliated Individual - 41

PSAE050 - Current Land Use/Management

Langston Golf Course - 42

Unaffiliated Individual - 41

PSCA001 - Non-goose impacts on water quality

Unaffiliated Individual - 7 , 16

PSCA010 - Other stressors on restored wetlands

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 14

PSCA020 - Current and future land-use

Anacostia Waterfront Corporation - 46

GeesePeace - 36

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 14

PSCC001 - Governmental

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5 , 47

GeesePeace - 36

Prince George's County - 48

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project - 49

Unaffiliated Individual - 21 , 41

PSCC010 - Non-governmental

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5

GeesePeace - 36

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

Unaffiliated Individual - 1 , 21 , 26 , 41

PSHS001 - Impacts on human health

AWCAC - 3

Anacostia Watershed Society - 5 , 20

GeesePeace - 36

Langston Golf Course - 42

Unaffiliated Individual – 45, 2 , 8 , 25

PSHS010 - Donation of Carcasses

Unaffiliated Individual - 9

PSPN001 - Scope of plan

Anacostia Waterfront Corporation - 46
Anacostia Watershed Society - 47
GeesePeace - 36 , 38
Langston Golf Course - 42
Sierra Club - 37
The Humane Society of the United States - 30
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 14
Unaffiliated Individual - 9 , 16 , 31 , 41, 45

PSPN005 - Location for marsh restoration action

The Humane Society of the United States - 30
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 14

PSPN010 - NPS Plan needs EIS

The Humane Society of the United States - 30

PSPN015 - NPS Policy

The Humane Society of the United States - 30
Unaffiliated Individual - 41

PSPN030 - Public Participation: Mailing list

Unaffiliated Individual - 41

PSSM001 - Scientific data must support action taken

The Humane Society of the United States - 30
Unaffiliated Individual - 9 , 31 , 41

PSSM010 - Zero case scenario

Unaffiliated Individual - 39 , 41

PSVE001 - Goose impacts

Anacostia Watershed Society - 20
Unaffiliated Individual - 2 , 8 , 25 , 41