

REPORT DEMOGRAPHICS – CHOH PROJECT 18554 - Retaining Wall, 11900 River Road, Potomac, MD										12/12/2007
Corr. ID	Correspondence	Receipt Date	Organization	Name	Address	City	State	Postal Code	E-mail Address	Kept Private
20	<p>Hagerstown, MD 21740 WEST MONTGOMERY COUNTY CITIZENS ASSOCIATION P.O. Box 59335 ! Potomac, Maryland 20859-933 Founded 1947</p> <p>29-Nov-07</p> <p>Mr. Kevin Brandt, Superintendent C&O Canal National Historic Park 1850 Dual Highway, Suite 100</p> <p>Dear Superintendent Brandt,</p> <p>We strongly object to any proposal that allows the wall to be rebuilt anywhere within the 200' easement setback. We are further opposed to an engineered solution. This wall repair, constituting the only proposal from the applicant and is no more than a band-aid to fix the currently crumbling section and offering no guarantee that we won't be back in a year to address further retaining wall failure. In the best of times, the poorly constructed retaining wall is both a danger and an eyesore when seen from any vantage, and particularly from the towpath and the Potomac River.</p> <p>We believe the best long term solution is to remove the wall entirely, regrade the slope, plant substantial native evergreen and perennial shrub and tree cover to hold the slope both above and below where the wall now stands. This would also screen the house from the towpath. Then the replacement of trees you required following the 130 trees cut in 2004 by the property owner would stand some chance of survival. Those that were planted appear dead and have yet to be replaced.</p> <p>Allowing any future activity within that 200' foot easement sets a precedent we do not wish to see repeated by other property owners up and down the Potomac River and the NHP. It is troubling that MNCPPC allowed the ballroom addition while ignoring the potential increased pressure this construction would place on the wall. We do not favor the No Action Alternative which has been the status quo for sometime now but a solution that both considers and increases the natural environment and the viewscape of the C&O Canal park.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ginny Barnes, President</p> <p>10311 Glen Rd. Potomac, Md. 20854 ~ (301) 762-6423 (phone) (301) 762-9287 (fax)</p>	12/3/2007	West Montgomery County Citizens Association	Barnes, Ginny	10311 Glen Road	Potomac	MD	20854		No

4	<p>It was bad enough that Daniel Snyder illegally removed trees to improve his view of the Potomac River, but to build an addition on land that is not stable, and then expect the Park Service to bend the rules for him, is outrageous. Any engineer or even an architect should/would have known that the wall was crumbling and had partially collapsed and should/would have recommended not building on that unstable land. But Snyder went ahead and added on to his mansion, and he now expects the government to bail him out. That is patently ridiculous, and the Park Service must not cave in to this man's giant ego. The house used to be just fine for a queen without his addition! Let him build a new wall farther up the slope on his own property!!</p> <p>Nancy Bowen</p>	11/15/2007		Bowen, Nancy	Kept Private						Yes
9	<p>We so not think more area on the slope should be disturbed. If the wall must be repaired, the owner should replace it with one closer to the house. To encroach further into the Natl Park Easement would be yet another Natl Park Service giving in to people of money & legal power, and would open the flood gates to others who wish to take advantage of the system.</p> <p>The VAST AREA which was totally disturbed and severely compromised in the Natl Scenic Easement by Snyder's removal of so many trees should be again replanted with larger caliper trees, not the small sproutling. Many, if not most of the seedlings planted by the owner have not survived.</p>	11/20/2007		Buchanan, Robert and Sharon .	11544 Spring Ridge Road	Potomac	MD	20854			No

23	<p>Superintendent C&O Canal National Historical Park 1850 Dual Highway, Suite 100 Hagerstown, MD 21740</p> <p>Re: Public Scoping - Retaining Wall 11900 River Road, Potomac, MD</p> <p>1. I am providing these comments solely on my own behalf.</p> <p>2. According to the United States Code, Title 16, Chapter 1, Subchapter I, The purpose of national parks is "... to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>3. According to the U.S. Code, Title XVI, Subchapter LVI "... the canal and towpath of the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park are hereby dedicated to Justice William O. Douglas in grateful recognition of his long and outstanding service as a prominent American conservationist and for his efforts to preserve and protect the canal and towpath from development."</p> <p>4. Granting a landowner a special exception to move his retaining wall two feet further toward the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal undermines the purpose of the National Park System, at large, as implemented by President Theodore Roosevelt, and, in this particular case, the vision of Justice William O. Douglas for a C&O Canal free of unnecessary and frivolous development.</p> <p>5. The primary purpose of our National Park System is to preserve the scenic grandeur of our national heritage. The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal supports this purpose as an inspirational monument to nineteenth century American engineering, as a recreational area, and as a wildlife sanctuary. The C&O Canal NHP is part of our nation's natural and historic legacy that our generation is responsible for passing to future generations unblemished, and in the same condition that we received it. In fact and deed, the C&O Canal National Historical Park supports this vision with Living History displays, Canal Boat rides, museums, and as a refuge for migratory birds and insects. A bust of William O. Douglas in Georgetown recalls his vision, gives hope that it will endure, and reminds our nation of its responsibility to C&O Canal National Historical Park.</p> <p>6. Landowners purchasing property adjacent to the C&O Canal National Historical Park are responsible for the due diligence of</p>	11/29/2007		Dix, John W.	9722 Pleasant Gate Lane	Potomac	MD	20854		No
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	--	--------------	-------------------------	---------	----	-------	--	----

visitors a year, who visit the C&O Canal to reflect on this nation's history and enjoy the legacy of its natural heritage of plants and animals.

11. I would prefer to see an Evaluation of Alternatives, instead of fast track, high pressure approval of this uncreative design that directly conflicts with the original intended purposes of the National Park System, in general, and the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, in particular. Is it necessary to replace the retaining wall at all?

12. Perhaps the landowner could use terraces instead, beginning at his house and ending at the current location of the retaining wall. No trees would have to be cut down and the terraces could provide habitat for native plants and animals that are being destroyed in parts of Montgomery County by continued land development, and unrestricted infill, and special exceptions to local zoning codes. Please don't let Montgomery County's destructive land use practices extend to the C& O Canal National Historical Park, or its scenic easements.

13. Thank you for taking time to read this letter. I hope these comments will be helpful and of interest to you.

"Expressio unis est exclusio alterius."

Sincerely

John W. Dix

CC:

1. Montgomery Commissioners to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission:

Ms. Nancy C. Long
31 Wellesely Circle
Glen Echo, MD 20812

Jo Reynolds
10909 Rock Run Road
Potomac, MD 20854

2. Montgomery County, Distric 16 Delegation, to the Maryland General Assembly

14	<p>The width of the C & O Park is very narrow. Hence the edges of this park must be carefully protected. Most homeowners have been extremely cooperative, have preserved trees and shrubs and have retained the screen of vegetation between their homes and the Canal area. Mr. Snyder is an exception I am very sorry to say. He cut down trees illegally. The trees he replanted are tiny and have mostly died. Now there is a problem of erosion. Is this at all surprising? He has constructed extensions on his house that were not properly reinforced. With the trees gone the soil is eroding and the retaining wall that was constructed is failing. There is no reason to grant a further exception for this kind and quality of construction. The proposed work damages the Park and the interests of the other homeowners living along the park. This proposed construction will further erode the bank, fill the Canal with silt, and act as a precedent for others who likewise wantonly disregard the interests of the Park and its beauty.</p> <p>Charles F. Doran President Brickyard Road Citizens Association</p> <p>Potomac Maryland</p>	11/29/2007	Brickyard Road Citizens Association	Doran, Charles F.	8544 Brickyard Rd	Potomac	MD	20854	CFDoran@jhu.edu	No
12	<p>Thank you for accepting my comments regarding the failed slope retention wall at 11900 River Road, Potomac Maryland. I am an environmental engineer and reside very close to the property and am familiar with the foliage present before the slope was denuded and the retaining wall which was installed afterwards. Given the extremely steep slope at this location and its proximity to the Park (within 200' of the restricted area) I do not support any engineered solution to address the significant erosion at the location. I recommend instead reclamation of the slope through extensive planting of trees and shrubs which once established would serve to 1) stabilize the earth on the slope and 2) control runoff. Planting native species of trees and shrubs will ensure the long term survival of the remedy, provide the least impact to surrounding flora and fauna, move the property closer to restoration of the damage executed when the slope was denuded and finally provide a remedy which would be acceptable to the surrounding community who use the Park. Long term monitoring and maintenance of the plantings will be necessary to ensure the establishment and survival of the plantings and ongoing care and maintenance should be incorporated in the overall cost of the project. I appreciate your consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Liza Wilson Durant, PhD 11620 Beall Mountain Road Potomac, Maryland 20854 301.806.2393</p>	11/29/2007		durant, liza w.	11620 beall mountain road potomac, maryland 20854	potomac	MD	20854	durant8@verizon.net	No

8	I think that any NPS property MUST be maintained by NPS. Home owners may pay for damages if they caused them. I beleive once you allow a home owner to make repairs on property owned by the NPS you set a precident. Isn't it enough that the owner paid the park service to have trees removed, didn't fulfill his end of the bargain as required & caused erosion problems making this wall necessary. Homeowners shouldn't get "special" allowances no matter how much money they have.	11/20/2007		Fritter-Natali, Sandra K.	Kept Private						Yes
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	--	------------------------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	-----

19	<p>Comments on Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historic Park: Project Scoping - Retaining Wall, 11900 River Road, Potomac, MD</p> <p>30-Nov-07</p> <p>Mr. Kevin Brandt, Superintendent C&O Canal National Historic Park 1850 Dual Highway, Suite 100 Hagerstown, MD 21740</p> <p>Dear Superintendent Brandt:</p> <p>I have attended the 11/7/07 Public Scoping meeting for the proposed retaining wall at 11900 River Road, Potomac, MD. I have read the Project Scoping document and I have had the opportunity to examine a number of plans for 11900 River Road on file at the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS), including the "Design Calculations for Wall Repair For Riverhouse Retaining Wall, 11900 River Road, Potomac, Maryland" dated 5/2/06.</p> <p>This precedent-setting request by the owner of this property should require the most scrupulous consideration of the facts because of the implications for the 263 other properties with such easements along the length of this historic park. The 200-foot setback requirement must be treated as the absolute minimum to help to protect the scenic easement for park users. Unfortunately, the facts will show that the 200-foot setback is wholly inadequate for this particular property. However, since nothing can be done to widen this easement, it is imperative that there be no further intrusions into it and efforts be made to minimize or eliminate past intrusions.</p> <p>As you know, fill was brought onto the property about 50 years ago in order to level part of the slope to apparently allow for the construction of the house closer to the canal and river and at a higher elevation. According to the "Design Calculations" document, which detailed borings done for four segments on the hillside near the retaining wall, topsoil on top of fill ranges from a depth of 7 feet to 11 feet in three of the segments that are adjacent to the house. It is clear from the three pages of section views of Segments 2, 3 and 4 that the slope under the fill is less steep than the slope of the fill.</p> <p>The "Design Calculations" document notes that 65 feet of wall is "collapsed" and the replacement retaining wall is to include 201 feet out of a total length of 400 feet. We are told that there are no footings or drainage for the entire wall, yet we only learn of the condition and plans for about 50% of the wall. There apparently is no explanation</p>	11/30/2007	Montgomery Preservation, Inc.	Goldstein, Wayne .	3009 Jennings Road, Kensington, MD 20895	Kensington	MD	20895	waynemgoldstein@ hotmail.com	No
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------------------	------------	----	-------	---------------------------------	----

<p>as to why there are no plans for the remaining 199 feet of wall.</p> <p>As a minimum starting point, a new retaining wall should not be allowed to be built in the easement area. If a new retaining wall were to be built at the crest of the hill, on the edge of the easement area, this would protect the house from any movement that could have been caused by shifting fill. It then seems that the owner should be asked to then remove all of the fill between the existing and new retaining walls as well as the existing retaining wall itself. The owner has stated a concern that if the retaining wall is not replaced, then the fill will flow down the hill and into the canal. With this problem solved by a new retaining wall at the crest of the hill, it then seems that the owner would be willing to remove this fill that could otherwise end up in the canal. It also seems that the owner would be willing to plant larger trees on the gentler slopes, including large evergreen trees close to the house that would provide screening of the house.</p> <p>According to the DPS website, the owner applied for a permit to construct a retaining wall on 5/04/06, Permit Number 419917, stating that the cost to build it would be \$460,000. If this is the cost to build a wall 201 feet long, as stated in the "Design Calculations" document, then the price is an average of \$2288 per linear foot. If it is accurate to extrapolate this cost to the entire 400-foot length of the existing retaining wall, this would work out to a cost to replace the entire retaining wall of \$915,000. For information purposes only, it might be useful to ask the owner to get the actual cost estimate to build a new retaining wall the entire length of the existing retaining wall as well as a price estimate to build a retaining wall next to the existing buildings.</p> <p>However, there is an alternative solution that would be far better for the environment, for the scenic view from the tow path in the park, and for the preservation of the historic character of this unique, nationally-important historic resource. According to the drawings associated with a DPS permit issued 4/1/02, a third story was added to the house, increasing the total height of the building from the south elevation facing the park to 56 feet, which includes a walkout basement. To at least some regular users of the towpath, the house appears to loom even more above the towpath, this being the result of its being much taller, as well as there being much less tree cover between the house and the tow path. The height of the adjacent building housing a ballroom on top of a 12-car garage is 35 feet. However, the current grade of the soil at the ballroom building at the lowest point appears to be 17 feet lower than the house, which seems to further accentuate the greater height of the house itself. A newspaper photo taken from the Virginia side shows how the house appears to dominate the setting as it sits upon what looks like a</p>									
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>raised plateau. The photo can be seen at: http://www.connectionnewspapers.com/lgphoto.asp?photo=90850_112111329.jpg</p> <p>The alternative solution would be to move the house and ballroom back from the crest of the hill about 200 feet, remove all of the fill - which would likely eliminate the need for any retaining walls at all - and reforest the gentler slopes with large trees with a 4-inch up to an 8-inch caliper that would then be watered and fertilized with a drip irrigation - "fertigation" - system that could maximize future growth of the trees. I will be sending a description of the dimensions of the two buildings to building movers on or near the East Coast to seek estimates of the feasibility and cost to move the two buildings and share this information with you at a future date.</p> <p>If the owner were to go with the option of building a new retaining wall at the base of the house and at the base of the ballroom building and were to then remove the fill below this new wall, the proposed reforestation with large trees could still be achieved.</p> <p>A compromise position, to be considered only if the owner is unwilling to agree to these options, would be to allow a lower replacement retaining wall in front of the existing one, but require that it run the length of the entire current wall, require that a second, upper retaining wall be built next to the house and ballroom in exchange for permission to build the lower retaining wall, require that most of the fill be removed in the area between the lower and upper walls, require that the old wall be removed where visible, require the planting of large trees and the installation of a fertigation system to benefit the trees, and require that the largest available evergreen trees be planted as a hedge next to the back of the house in order to block the view of the house from the tow path year around.</p> <p>/s/ Wayne Goldstein President, Montgomery Preservation, Inc. 3009 Jennings Road Kensington, MD 20895 301-942-8079</p> <p>waynemgoldstein@hotmail.com</p>									
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

18	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I grew up in Montgomery County and spent many a day hiking the length of the canal. It is a wonderful National Park that we need to continue to protect and support.</p> <p>My children now frequent the canal for walks with our dogs, visits to the museums and the lockes, nature walks, iceskating and other activities. They love it as much or more than I do.</p> <p>They insisted on coming to the meeting held on Nov 7th. They want to be involved in solving the problem and protecting this beautiful place. My children, Julia age 8, and Charlie age 6, are passionate about this.</p> <p>We attended the meeting as a family and Julia actually stood up and made a comment. This took a lot of nerve on her part; I write this soley to emphasize the depth of their concern for the canal and in particular for this problem.</p> <p>I would hope that the NPS will act responsibly, with the canal as its number one priority (not a private home owner who has damaged the canal)in solving the problem. There is no doubt something must be done, but "the something" is the important point. I hope the NPS will obtain a professional independent engineering assessment and recommenations that solve the private citizen's problem but do not continue to impact negatively on the canal and ensure that the easements will not be further violated. This is not a decision that can be made with out a lot more information. It is the NPS's responsibility to obtain that information and then act accordingly.</p> <p>Thank you, Margaret Granitto</p>	11/30/2007		Granitto, Margaret H.	7701 Groton Rd beth,MD 20817	bethesda	MD	20817	mgranitto@suburba nhospital.org	No
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	--	--------------------------	---------------------------------	----------	----	-------	------------------------------------	----

17	<p>I attended the public scoping meeting for the Retaining Wall at 11900 River Road, Potomac, MD.</p> <p>I believe that NPS should not entertain any solution that includes a retaining wall replacement, repair, or addition to the 11900 address until the following factors are considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. NPS should get an independent engineering assesment of the situation2. Consider moving the house back from the edge of the steep slope - quite an engineering feat - which would enable the owner of the property to restore the slope to it's original grade and then properly reforest it.3. Recognize that there are multiple bad decisions that have culminated in the decision to install this retaining wall. Each of those decisions should be "un-done" to return the conservation area to it's original state. <p>I am uncomfortable with the relationship that the owners/attorney's of 19000 River Road have with NPS senior officials and Montgomery County DPS staff. I believe that "heads have been turned" and undue pressure has been applied to allow this individual to continue to violate the Park's easement. The message that should be sent to ALL citizens is "DO NOT VIOLATED THE C & O NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK'S CONSERVATION EASEMENT". Special treatment is only given to the C & O Park, not people.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Adrienne Gude</p>	11/30/2007		Gude, Adrienne A.	4000 Mass Ave., NW Apt 1222	Washington	DC	20016	agudlewis@hotmail.com	No
1	<p>I ask that this repair be made in the most environmentally sensitive manner possible. I ask that land disturbance belimited and not one drop of soil enter the canal. I would also like to see the wall be built higher than it was so that the home owners do not benefit from their earlier cutting of the trees on that bank. I realize that you may have no control over the wall height but please ensure that the environment is not further damaged by this repair.</p> <p>Sherry Kinikin</p> <p>Canal walker</p>	11/6/2007		Kinikin, Sherry	Kept Private					Yes

2	<p>Mr. Lawler,</p> <p>I read in The Washington Post about Mr. Snyder's appeal of the decision not to let him "repair" a wall in the C&O Canal right of way. The article stated there was a public comment period, but didn't say how or where to comment.</p> <p>I suggest the National Park Service acted correctly to refuse Mr. Snyder's request. He already destroyed our view by cutting down the trees. Let him install a new wall on his property rather than damage our property. After the C & O canal belongs to all America, not Mr. Snyder.</p> <p>If there is some place other than with you that I should express my opinion, please let me know.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Tim McGowan</p>	11/13/2007		McGowan, Tim	Kept Private						Yes
13	<p>Dear Staff : I believe that re-building or even repairing the retaining wall in question would be in clear violation of the 200 foot easement that currently is in effect along the C & O Canal Park. The best solution for the long term would be to remove the wall carefully and re-plant the site of the wall with soil-retaining shrubs and trees. To approve the owner's request would increase the probability of other individuals whose land also borders the Park proposing other artificial building projects within the easement. I have lived not far from the C & O Canal for many years and believe this proposed wall repair is a significant threat to the natural beauty and attractiveness of the park. Thank you for considering my views.</p>	11/29/2007		mcnellis, donald .	11805 gregerscroft rd.	potomac	MD	20854			No

15	<p>Mr. Kevin Brandt Superintendent C&O Canal National Historical Park 1850 Dual Highway, Suite 100 Hagerstown, MD 21740</p> <p>30-Nov-07</p> <p>Re: NEPA Scoping for Retaining Wall, 11900 River Road, Potomac, MD</p> <p>Dear Superintendent Brandt:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the appropriate scope of NEPA documentation for reconstruction of the retaining wall at 11900 River Road in Potomac. Since 1993, the Potomac Conservancy has been protecting the health, beauty, and enjoyment of the Potomac River and its tributaries. The Audubon Naturalist Society fosters stewardship of our region's environment by educating citizens about the natural world, promoting conservation of biodiversity, and protecting wildlife habitat. Both the Potomac Conservancy and the Audubon Naturalist Society seek to provide thoughtful and practical solutions to the complex challenges facing the C&O Canal National Historical Park, particularly when the issue at hand affects the Park's scenic easements. Maintaining the integrity of the scenic easements is crucial to protecting the park's beauty and enjoyment for the over three million people that visit every year.</p> <p>The Potomac Conservancy and Audubon Naturalist Society believe that the upcoming Environmental Assessment (EA) process is the Park's best opportunity to thoroughly investigate the facts involved with the proposed retaining wall rebuilding, identify all of the viable alternatives, and choose the path that will best protect the C&O Canal and the integrity of all the Park's scenic easements. In order to do this, we believe the EA should do the following:</p> <p>1. Establish the relevant facts. When was the retaining wall originally built? If it was built after October 1, 1974 (the date of the scenic easement), did NPS grant permission for its construction? If it was built before October 1, 1974, did the scenic easement specifically intend to prohibit its rebuilding, or was the presence of the wall within 200 feet of the canal unintentionally overlooked during the easement drafting? These answers to these questions should be taken into consideration when determining the most appropriate solution to the</p>	11/30/2007	Potomac Conservancy	Merwin, Anne .	8601 Georgia Ave Suite 612	Silver Spring	MD	20910	merwin@potomac. org	No
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	---------------------	----------------	-------------------------------	---------------	----	-------	------------------------	----

We look forward to seeing the results of this EA, and to working with NPS and the property owner to quickly find a common-sense solution that will protect the C&O Canal itself, and the integrity of the Park's scenic resources and its scenic easement program.

Sincerely,

Anne Merwin
Director of Policy, Potomac Conservancy

Dolores Milmoe
Audubon Naturalist Society

11	<p>I am against allowing this property to infringe further on the beauty of the C&O canal and our National park. To allow this mega size property to disregard the easement restrictions will open up all properties backing up to the river to follow suit. We need to say No to these "special exceptions" and remind these owners they knew the property easements when they purchased and renovated these homes.</p> <p>My family plans on using the canal as a retreat and exercise path for many years and hopes the beauty will not be tarnished by one families need for an oversized ballroom.</p>	11/29/2007		N/A	Kept Private						Yes
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	--	-----	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	-----

to the structural integrity of the homeowner's residence.

If all or part of the wall is rebuilt, we encourage the NPS to require mitigation measures by the landowner to offset the visual impact of a rebuilt wall. Those measures should include native plantings to soften the hardscape as well as to help stabilize the slope, and using stone or other native materials that will blend into the landscape better than does the existing wall.

Future actions must further the mutual commitment by the NPS and the property owner to honor the fundamental purposes of the scenic easement, including protecting the C&O Canal National Historical Park.

Prompt action is required to protect the canal from the risk of total failure of the existing retaining wall. NPCA encourages the NPS to act as quickly as is possible. Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and please feel free to contact me as this matter moves forward.

Sincerely,

(signed)

Joy M. Oakes
Senior Mid-Atlantic Regional Director
National Parks Conservation Association
1300 19th ST NW, Suite 300
Washington D.C. 20036
202-454-3386

10	<div>28-Nov-07</div> <div>11/28/2007</div> <div>C&O Canal Association</div> <div>Preston, Ned .</div> <div>POB 366 Glen Echo, MD 20812</div> <div>Bethesda</div> <div>MD</div> <div>20817</div> <div>inquiries@candoca nal.org</div> <div>No</div>	<p>Superintendent Kevin Brandt C&O Canal National Historical Park 1850 Dual Highway, Suite 100 Hagerstown, Md. 21740</p> <p>Dear Superintendent Brandt:</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed repair of the retaining wall at 11900 River Road, Potomac. Md. During this scoping phase of the process, individuals and organizations are invited to identify issues and concerns that should be considered in the environmental assessment. On behalf of the C&O Canal Association, therefore, I wish to submit the following brief comments:</p> <p>The wall is within 200 feet of the C&O Canal and within property covered by a scenic easement held by the C&O Canal National Historical Park. Located on the crest of a high bluff, the structure is highly visible from the towpath. It significantly affects the experience of park visitors seeking to enjoy the area's scenic and historical qualities. In addition, the wall has important impacts the vicinity's natural environment. Possible methods used in the structure's repair or replacement may alter such factors as erosion, runoff into the canal, and the health of trees and other vegetation on the slope below it.</p> <p>The proposed project may have the potential to increase the area's environmental problems, or perhaps to mitigate them. It should therefore receive extremely careful consideration, including an independent engineering study. In determining the outcome, the welfare of the Park should be paramount.</p> <p>Thank you for your kind attention.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ned Preston, Information Officer</p>
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5	<p>As a Potomac, MD resident I strongly oppose allowing Mr. Snyder to rebuild the wall. It was his own ego and selfishness that created this situation. Had he not blatantly cut down the trees in clear violation of our laws, he would still have a stable hill. Mr. Snyder is not above the law. No citizen has the right to encroach on parkland (as he did when he cut down the trees) for their own enjoyment. His total disregard for others has come back to haunt him. The C&O Canal is a beautiful park for all of us to enjoy, not just Mr. Snyder.</p> <p>Mr. Snyder should be forced to plant tall evergreen trees along the entire slope, as well as on the top of the hill. The trees would hold the bank in place and it would help to restore the hill to it's natural state. It would also satisfy those of us who enjoy the Canal and prefer not to look at his ostentatious home. This would be a fair solution and would remove the eye sore from the rest of us who obey the law. Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	11/15/2007		Round, James	Kept Private					Yes
3	<p>The beauty and value of the park, especially in an urban region such as Washington, need no explanation. I ride hundreds of miles a year on the canal towpath, and see thousands of others also enjoying the opportunity.</p> <p>Simply put, the property owner is trying to change the rules of the game after the fact. The scenic easement was created for a purpose; the property owner knew, or should have known, of the easement. Ample notice was provided to all. Now, as a person of wealth and influence, the property owner is seeking to get preferential treatment. And, of course, this property owner has already taken advantage of the public interest in another situation.</p> <p>I urge you to maintain the easement, to not allow an exception, and to not allow the reconstruction.</p> <p>If there is anyone who should understand the notion of "a deal is a deal," it is this property owner.</p> <p>Please do not compromise the public interest, by sacrificing the easement requirements, for the sake of a narrow private interest, as is sought here.</p> <p>Thank you for taking my comment.</p>	11/14/2007		Schmitt, C .		Oakton	VA	22124		No

7	I am sure the National Park Service has better things to spend money on than rebuilding the wall in question. The hypothetical "damage" to the park is entirely blown out of proportion by a wealthy near-by landowner who has a strong lobby trying to push this to go through. The landowner in question developed a reputation with the park services once he had surrounding trees and wildlife removed by illegal means. This resulted in an eyesore to all of those who enjoyed the Potomac River and its' beauty and have lived there for a long time. I beg you not to construct a wall that benefits none, but one near-by landowner.	11/15/2007	Potomac Friends	Vero, Cynthia B.		potomac	MD	20854	giallo5678@yahoo.com	No
6	I am disturbed that Redskin owner Daniel Snyder illegally removed hundreds of trees so he could have a better view of the Potomac River and now has the nerve to have a wall adjacent to his home rebuilt. Even though this is beside the point - This is an owner that moved to Washington and made fans pay to watch practice Redskins game and further made the Redskins the most expensive team for a family to watch in the country (but really that is beside the point and is not my argument). If Snyder got his way it would truly demonstrate that money buys influence and influence got its' way. You are not accountable for this wall as councilman Erlich's aide had implied. If this wall is to be rebuilt it should be paid by Snyder in full.	11/15/2007		Vero, Jacob B.		Potomac	MD	20854	giallo5678@yahoo.com	No
22	I am writing to oppose allowing the owner of the property at 11900 River Road to rebuild a failing retaining wall that is within the National Park Service easement on the property. The property owner can either build a new retaining wall outside the NPS easement or handle the problem of the steep slope above the easement by planting soil retaining trees and ground cover. However, the property owner should be expected to assure the stability of the area within the easement by replanting the trees that he was required to plant and assuring their survival and growth.	11/29/2007		Williams, Lois .	9418 Thrush Lane	Potomac	MD	29854	loiswilliams@starpower.net	No