



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

***Alternatives Newsletter Comment Analysis Report***  
**November 6, 2008**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>INTRODUCTION</i> .....	3
<i>THE COMMENT ANALYSIS PROCESS</i> .....	3
<i>DEFINITION OF TERMS</i> .....	4
<i>GUIDE TO THIS DOCUMENT</i> .....	4
<b>CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT</b> .....	4
<b>INDEX BY ORGANIZATION TYPE</b> .....	4
<b>CORRESPONDENCE INDEX BY STATE</b> .....	4
<b>COMMENT SUMMARY</b> .....	5
<b>CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS</b> .....	5
<b>CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF INDIVIDUAL COMMENTORS</b> .....	5
<b>INDEX BY CODE</b> .....	5
<b>COMMENT DISTRIBUTION BY CODE</b> .....	6
<b>CORRESPONDENCE DISTRIBUTION BY ORGANIZATION TYPE</b> .....	6
<b>CORRESPONDENCE DISTRIBUTION BY STATE</b> .....	6
<b>ANACOSTIA PARK WETLANDS MANAGEMENT PLAN WITH RESIDENT CANADA GOOSE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ALTERNATIVES NEWSLETTER COMMENT SUMMARY</b> .....	7
<b>AL1100 - NEW ALTERNATIVES</b> .....	7
<b>AL1300 - ALTERNATIVES: NEW ELEMENTS</b> .....	7
<b>AL1500 - ALTERNATIVE B: SUPPORTS ALTERNATIVE</b> .....	8
<b>AL1900 - VEGETATIVE BUFFERS</b> .....	8
<b>AL2500 - SUPPORTS INTERPRETIVE SIGNAGE</b> .....	9
<b>AL2700 - TRASH MANAGEMENT</b> .....	9
<b>AL3300 - QUESTIONS CERTAIN METHODS</b> .....	9
<b>AL3700 - VEGETATION</b> .....	9
<b>AL3900 - ALTERNATIVE D: SUPPORTS ALTERNATIVE</b> .....	10
<b>AL4000 - ALTERNATIVE ELEMENTS: SUPPORTS NON-LETHAL MEASURES</b> .....	10
<b>AL4100 - ALTERNATIVE ELEMENTS: HYDROLOGY</b> .....	10
<b>AL4200 - LETHAL CONTROL</b> .....	11
<b>AL4300 - ALTERNATIVE ELEMENTS: SCARE TACTICS</b> .....	11
<b>AL4400 - ALTERNATIVE ELEMENTS: FENCING</b> .....	11
<b>AL4500 - INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL</b> .....	12
<b>AL4600 - EGG ADDLING</b> .....	12
<b>AL4700 - CULTURAL EDUCATION: PURPOSE AND NEED</b> .....	12
<b>AL4900 - GOOSE NEST DESTRUCTION</b> .....	12
<b>DE1100 - DOCUMENT EDITS</b> .....	13
<b>PN1100 - PURPOSE AND NEED: METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS</b> .....	13
<b>PN1300 - PURPOSE AND NEED: FEASIBILITY</b> .....	14
<b>PN1500 - PURPOSE AND NEED: SCOPE OF PROJECT</b> .....	14
<b>WH1100 - WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE HABITAT</b> .....	14
<b>CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS</b> .....	15
<b>CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF INDIVIDUAL COMMENTORS</b> .....	15
<b>INDEX BY ORGANIZATION TYPE</b> .....	16
<b>COMMENT INDEX BY CODE</b> .....	17

## ***Introduction***

On August 29, 2008 Anacostia Park released the Alternatives Newsletter for the Wetlands Management Plan/EIS with Resident Canada Goose Management Strategies for public review and comment. The public was invited to submit comments on alternatives through October 3, 2008. The newsletter provided background on the Anacostia Park wetlands management and resident Canada goose management strategies and outlined proposed alternatives to be evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement. During the comment period, seven 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 Management 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 commentors live, the number of letters received from different categories of organizations, etc.

### **Index by Organization Type**

This table identifies all of the codes that were assigned to each individual piece of correspondence and is arranged by organization type. Individual commentors are also included in this report and are identified as Unaffiliated Individuals.

### **Correspondence Index by State**

This table identifies the correspondence by US state.

## **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): 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 Commentors**

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 Code**

This lists which commentors 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*

<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Number of Comments</b>
AL1100	New Alternatives	6
AL1300	Alternatives: New Elements	13
AL1500	Alternative B: Supports Alternative	5
AL1900	Vegetative Buffers	1
AL2500	Supports Interpretive Signage	1
AL2700	Trash Management	1
AL3300	Questions Certain Methods	7
AL3700	Vegetation	2
AL3900	Alternative D: Supports Alternative	2
AL4000	Alternative Elements: Supports Non-Lethal Measures	4
AL4100	Alternative Elements: Hydrology	6
AL4200	Lethal Control	3
AL4300	Alternative Elements: Scare Tactics	5
AL4400	Alternative Elements: Fencing	3
AL4500	Invasive Species Control	2
AL4600	Egg Addling	5
AL4700	Cultural Education: Purpose and Need	2
AL4900	Goose Nest Destruction	2
DE1100	Document Edits	4
PN1100	Purpose and Need: Methods and Assumptions	4
PN1300	Purpose and Need: Feasibility	2
PN1500	Purpose and Need: Scope of Project	6
WH1100	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat	5

### *Correspondence Distribution by Organization Type*

<b>Organization Type</b>	<b>Number of Correspondences</b>
Civic Groups	1
Town or City Government	1
Federal Government	1
Conservation/Preservation	1
Unaffiliated Individual	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>

### *Correspondence Distribution by State*

<b>State</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number of Correspondences</b>
CA	14%	1
MD	43%	3
DC	43%	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>

**Anacostia Park**  
**Wetlands Management Plan with Resident Canada Goose Management**  
**Strategies Environmental Impact Statement**  
**Alternatives Newsletter**  
**Comment Summary**

**AL1100 - New Alternatives**

**Concern ID:** 18373

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments suggest new alternatives.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 4

**Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States

**Comment ID:** 87123 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** The Alternatives should explicitly include steps to examine land use and consider changes to current and planned land use that could achieve the Objectives of the Plan/EIS.

**Corr. ID:** 4

**Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States

**Comment ID:** 87119 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** None of the Alternatives offers a completely humane goose management option. Alternative E does limit killing geese to certain population conditions. However, the rest of the elements in this Alternative would likely guarantee that those population conditions will exist because elements necessary to prevent those conditions are not included.

**Corr. ID:** 4

**Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States

**Comment ID:** 87124 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** As we commented in 2007 on the scope of the analysis, the Plan/EIS needs to analyze the viable alternative of a comprehensive community-wide goose management program. The Plan/EIS must develop a comprehensive program encompassing a significant portion of the land area within the flock's range. Since geese use a much wider geographic area than the wetlands within Anacostia Park, this alternative needs to include working cooperatively with state and local governments, 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 Park's wetlands.

**AL1300 - Alternatives: New Elements**

**Concern ID:** 18374

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments suggest including new elements in existing alternatives.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1

**Organization:** Public Stakeholder

**Comment ID:** 87138 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Requirement for a science based monitoring protocol for goose populations before, during and after goose management activities are implemented

**Corr. ID:** 3

**Organization:** Friends of Sligo Creek, Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee

**Comment ID:** 87133 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** A timeline- first removing the goose problem, and then working on wetlands creation

**Corr. ID:** 7                   **Organization:** USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center  
**Comment ID:** 87638   **Organization Type:** Federal Government  
**Representative Quote:** 4. Promote/coordinate wetland restoration in the Anacostia with the notion of 'creating' an integrated wetland system/habitat instead of the existing patchwork with the included goal of attracting wildlife needing 'tracts' of wetlands (rails, bitterns, marsh wrens, etc.). (e.g. increase wetlands & to integrate or not, restore existing, current level, do nothing&&).

**Corr. ID:** 7                   **Organization:** USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center  
**Comment ID:** 87639   **Organization Type:** Federal Government  
**Representative Quote:** 5. Any of the above and other efforts could and should include working/partnership with regional agencies (MWCOCG, USACE, DC Dept. of Env., NOAA, EPA, AWS, USDA Wildlife, etc.

**Corr. ID:** 6                   **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society  
**Comment ID:** 87150   **Organization Type:**  
**Representative Quote:** Use the meat---Though some members of the public will resist lethal control in principal, AWS believes that many others will find turning culled geese into food for human consumption a significant mitigating factor---one which we think will increase public acceptance of lethal control. (This, of course, assumes a food safety analysis be done for trace toxics, and thresholds are not exceeded. It also assumes successfully identifying a mechanism for turning euthanized geese into food, which might be Farmers and Hunters Feeding the Hungry, a chapter of which is in southern Maryland.)

### ***AL1500 - Alternative B: Supports Alternative***

**Concern ID:** 18375  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments voice support for Alternative B](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 2                   **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society  
**Comment ID:** 87134   **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** I support Alternative B -- Very high level of wetland management and very high level of goose management

### ***AL1900 - Vegetative Buffers***

**Concern ID:** 18379  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments support using vegetative buffers.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 6                   **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society  
**Comment ID:** 87151   **Organization Type:** Civic Groups  
**Representative Quote:** B. Vegetative Buffers---This is worth trying, particularly at the southern and northern end of Kingman Area 1, where mowed grass meets the high tide mark, allowing geese easy access from land to water. (A companion, 48-inch high wire fence stretched along the high tide mark at these spots would effectively block geese as the buffer vegetation grew in height and bulk, then could be removed so as not to block other wildlife that don't mind thick vegetation.)



### ***AL2500 - Supports Interpretive Signage***

**Concern ID:** 18385  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments support interpretive signage.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 6 **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society  
**Comment ID:** 87155 **Organization Type:** Civic Groups  
**Representative Quote:** Public Education---More signage is a good idea. So is more outreach to the public to communicate the impacts of resident geese--and why, in this situation, lethal control is justified. NPS has done the same with deer.

### ***AL2700 - Trash Management***

**Concern ID:** 18386  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments support trash management.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 6 **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society  
**Comment ID:** 87159 **Organization Type:** Civic Groups  
**Representative Quote:** Trash Management---Floatable trash accumulates behind goose exclosures, lodging there and looking awful, detracting from an otherwise aesthetic summertime experience of paddling through the marsh guts. Now that the Anacostia has been declared "trash impaired" by the U.S. EPA, Maryland and DC bear most of the burden for addressing this "psychological toxin." But NPS, as a major land manager along the tidal river, can help by stepping up attempts to intercept Anacostia Park-generated trash before it ends up in the river, and cooperating with other trash interception efforts made from your banks.

### ***AL3300 - Questions Certain Methods***

**Concern ID:** 18387  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments question certain methods.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 4 **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States  
**Comment ID:** 87127 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation  
**Representative Quote:** Similarly, what is the purpose of establishing nesting tolerance zones? Unless those zones are at a considerable distance from the brood-rearing habitat you seek to protect from browse, geese will walk their offspring from tolerated nest sites to that habitat. Canada geese have been known to walk offspring surprising distances to brood-rearing habitat; as far as a couple of miles or more.

### ***AL3700 - Vegetation***

**Concern ID:** 18388  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments suggest specific vegetation species for restoration/management.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 6 **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society  
**Comment ID:** 87157 **Organization Type:** Civic Groups  
**Representative Quote:** Vegetation---Nuphar advena (Yellow pond lily) is goose-resistant. So another possibility would be transplanting large amounts of this low-marsh perennial to Kingman. This might move in the direction of accepting low plant diversity as a final outcome at Kingman. But this is better than extensive, denuded mudflats&.AWS has had small-scale success the last three years transplanting unprotected Nuphar root-cuttings into low-

elevation mudflats at Kingman. They show some promise of expanding, even with current goose herbivory and---significantly---without protective fencing. If the future is projected to have some (if less) resident goose presence, Nuphar has a better chance than any other plant at persisting over time.

**Corr. ID:** 7                      **Organization:** USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center

**Comment ID:** 87641      **Organization Type:** Federal Government

**Representative Quote:** 7. Seek to restore submersed aquatic vegetation (SAV) in the tidal Anacostia

#### ***AL3900 - Alternative D: Supports Alternative***

**Concern ID:** 18389

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments support Alternative D.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1                      **Organization:** Public Stakeholder

**Comment ID:** 87137      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I support Alternative D (Moderate wetlands management & high level of goose management) - with the exception of the proposed use of goose scare/harassment tactics.

#### ***AL4000 - Alternative Elements: Supports Non-Lethal Measures***

**Concern ID:** 18390

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments support non-lethal goose management strategies.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 4                      **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States

**Comment ID:** 87120      **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** An alternative that includes no lethal control (other than egg treatment) must also include very aggressive humane management, such as the elements under Safety, Food, and Reproduction in Alternative B. (Note that while egg treatment may be classified as a lethal technique since an embryo dies, The HSUS considers early egg treatment to be humane.) Alternative B without Lethal Control would be a humane option and would have the greatest likelihood to substantially achieve the Plan/EIS objectives

#### ***AL4100 - Alternative Elements: Hydrology***

**Concern ID:** 18391

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments discuss hydrological elements of alternatives.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1                      **Organization:** Public Stakeholder

**Comment ID:** 87141      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Changes to the hydrologic regimes (i.e. regrading the wetlands), placing hard edged and/or permanent wetlands within the mainstem Anacostia River, and daylighting tributaries should NOT be within the scope of this analysis, which should focus on managing the wetlands as they exist now.

**Corr. ID:** 6                      **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society

**Comment ID:** 87156      **Organization Type:** Civic Groups

**Representative Quote:** Hydrology---Wetland elevation is critical. If there comes an opportunity to increase marsh elevations at Kingman Marsh to elevations that would support a greater diversity of plants, and at the same time not unduly increase the chances of inviting Phragmites and Purple loosestrife, this warrants consideration.

### ***AL4200 - Lethal Control***

**Concern ID:** 18392  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments support lethal goose control as part of wetlands management.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 6 **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society  
**Comment ID:** 87146 **Organization Type:** Civic Groups  
**Representative Quote:** In general, the Anacostia Watershed Society favors an approach that leaves lethal control of geese "in the toolbox."

### ***AL4300 - Alternative Elements: Scare Tactics***

**Concern ID:** 18393  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments discuss use of scare tactics.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 4 **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States  
**Comment ID:** 87128 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation  
**Representative Quote:** Using scare tactics prior to and during nesting may be counterproductive to reproductive control. Geese are strongly attached to their nest sites and are difficult to dislodge. When they are persuaded to move, they generally simply go as far as necessary to escape harassment and nest nearby. Harassing them from their nest sites will not prevent them from nesting; merely cause them to nest somewhere else and likely nearby. If you harass them away from their known nest site to an unknown nest site or to one that is difficult to access, your egg and nest treatment efforts could be seriously undermined as you may not find and treat these new nest sites. Allowing them to nest at their established sites that are known to the treatment program ensures that their nests will be treated

### ***AL4400 - Alternative Elements: Fencing***

**Concern ID:** 18395  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments discuss fencing as a management tool.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 6 **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society  
**Comment ID:** 87153 **Organization Type:** Civic Groups  
**Representative Quote:** Goose Exclusion Fencing---Don't go hog wild with more fencing. And please don't erect it where there will be indefinite reliance on the fencing to deter geese at a particular spot. Fencing has significant downsides: It impedes travel by other, nontarget wildlife. It is also costly, requires maintenance, and is visually obtrusive in a natural area. If a decision is made to erect more fencing, make a plan---date certain---to take it down. Budget for it. Do not rely on fencing long term because it is not sustainable and effects other wildlife.

### ***AL4500 - Invasive Species Control***

**Concern ID:** 18397

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments discuss invasive species management.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 5 **Organization:** District Department of the Environment  
**Comment ID:** 87115 **Organization Type:** Town or City Government  
**Representative Quote:** Finally, it is DDOE's opinion that invasive species management should continue at its most aggressive levels regardless of goose population management.  
**Corr. ID:** 6 **Organization:** Anacostia Watershed Society  
**Comment ID:** 87158 **Organization Type:** Civic Groups  
**Representative Quote:** Invasives---Manage invasive species? Absolutely. Particularly Phragmites. NPS should not go to a lot of trouble managing geese only to let Phragmites take over.

### ***AL4600 - Egg Addling***

**Concern ID:** 18398

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments discuss egg addling strategy.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** Public Stakeholder  
**Comment ID:** 87139 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** I would also like to see more extensive and effective methods used to locate nests within the park for egg addling activities.  
**Corr. ID:** 4 **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States  
**Comment ID:** 87126 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation  
**Representative Quote:** Under Reproduction, increasing egg addling is conditioned on significant population increase. This is looking at hatch prevention techniques the wrong way around. Prevention cannot wait until unwelcome geese have hatched. Implement hatch prevention as broadly as possible as soon as possible.

### ***AL4700 - Cultural Education: Purpose and Need***

**Concern ID:** 18399

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments discuss cultural education strategy.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** Public Stakeholder  
**Comment ID:** 87143 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** Some of the proposed actions listed appear to be unnecessary fluff, and don't to my mind need to be included in this analysis at all, e.g.: items listed under the "Cultural/Education" heading.

### ***AL4900 - Goose Nest Destruction***

**Concern ID:** 18400

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments discuss goose nest destruction strategy.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 4 **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States  
**Comment ID:** 87131 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation  
**Representative Quote:** The description of Alternative B, under Safety (page 4), states that NPS will "obtain Federal permits" for nest destruction and

removal. You should be aware that effective in September 2006 the federal US Fish and Wildlife Service removed the permit requirement for resident Canada goose nest and egg treatment. The NPS must merely register locations where it will treat nests and/or eggs online at the Service's website

**Corr. ID:** 7                      **Organization:** USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center

**Comment ID:** 87644      **Organization Type:** Federal Government

**Representative Quote:** D. Goose nest destruction should not be considered/mentioned. The prevailing understanding is that nest removal only encourages additional nest building in the area. By leaving nests with added eggs reduces chance of 'secondary' reproduction. One could opt for nest disturbance to incite the geese to go elsewhere but such action is not considered 'neighborly' (as would any action chasing geese away (noise, smelly retardants/repellants, etc.) since simply would move geese to someone else's 'backyard'.

### ***DE1100 - Document Edits***

**Concern ID:** 18401

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments suggest document edits.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 4                      **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States

**Comment ID:** 87130      **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** Also, Alternatives E & F's "less aggressive wetlands management" are not the same as "no wetlands management" that the label for Alternative F suggests is the intent of that alternative. The Summary would benefit from correcting these inconsistencies.

**Corr. ID:** 4                      **Organization:** The Humane Society of the United States

**Comment ID:** 87129      **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** The Alternatives Summary on page 3 of the mailer is at odds with the more detailed descriptions of the Alternatives on pages 4 through 7. In particular, Alternative F is described as having the "same less aggressive wetlands management techniques as Alternatives C & E." However, Alternative C is described as having "aggressive wetlands management options;" clearly not "less aggressive."

### ***PN1100 - Purpose and Need: Methods and Assumptions***

**Concern ID:** 18402

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Comments discuss methods and assumptions of plan.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1                      **Organization:** Public Stakeholder

**Comment ID:** 87144      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Egg addling is already approved as a goose management activity in the park, and all nests are treated according to protocols at the appropriate time. It seems incorrect then to "increase egg addling" as proposed in Alternatives B-D. Also, what is an "approved goose hatch control material?"

***PN1300 - Purpose and Need: Feasibility***

**Concern ID:** 18403

**CONCERN** Comments question feasibility of plan.

**STATEMENT:**

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** Public Stakeholder

**Comment ID:** 87142 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** This project seems to have the potential to morph into a "big gulp" analysis, with the park attempting to address as many past concerns related to the restored wetlands as possible. As a result the actions proposed seem too broad and unfocused. If Alternative B for example were selected the appropriate analysis required may be so complex and unwieldy as to be impossible to complete - let alone if there is money and/or the will to accomplish all that is proposed.

***PN1500 - Purpose and Need: Scope of Project***

**Concern ID:** 18406

**CONCERN** Comments discuss the scope of the proposed project.

**STATEMENT:**

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** Public Stakeholder

**Comment ID:** 87140 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I feel that the project title does not appropriately reflect the project intent. While there is an element that includes goose control - the project is in truth a "Wetlands Management Plan" of which goose control is an integral part. If the park does not feel comfortable approaching the goose control issue as a part of a wetland management project - perhaps that is an indicator that the goose control issue is more appropriately treated as a separate action and therefore would require separate environmental compliance.

***WH1100 - Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat***

**Concern ID:** 18407

**CONCERN** Comments discuss plans impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat.

**STATEMENT:**

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** Public Stakeholder

**Comment ID:** 87145 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Goose scare tactics should NOT be used within the park due to their negative impacts on native species that use the sites for habitat.

**Corr. ID:** 7 **Organization:** USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center

**Comment ID:** 87638 **Organization Type:** Federal Government

**Representative Quote:** 4. Promote/coordinate wetland restoration in the Anacostia with the notion of 'creating' an integrated wetland system/habitat instead of the existing patchwork with the included goal of attracting wildlife needing 'tracts' of wetlands (rails, bitterns, marsh wrens, etc.). (e.g. increase wetlands & to integrate or not, restore existing, current level, do nothing&&).

### *Correspondence Index of Organizations*

<b>Correspondence ID</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Kept Private</b>
<b>Civic Groups</b>			
6	McKindley-Ward, Steve	Anacostia Watershed Society	No
3	Smith, Michael R.	Friends of Sligo Creek, Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee	No
2	Kept Private	Anacostia Watershed Society	Yes
<b>Conservation/Preservation</b>			
4	Brasted, Maggie	The Humane Society of the United States	No
<b>Federal Government</b>			
7	Hammerschlag, Dick	USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center	No
<b>Town/City Government</b>			
5	King, Bryan D.	District Department of the Environment	No
<b>Unaffiliated Individual</b>			
1	Kept Private	Public Stakeholder	Yes

### *Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters*

<b>Correspondence ID</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
4	Brasted, Maggie	The Humane Society of the United States
7	Hammerschlag, Dick	USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center
5	King, Bryan D.	District Department of the Environment
6	McKindley-Ward, Steve	Anacostia Watershed Society
1	Kept Private	Public Stakeholder
3	Smith, Michael R.	Friends of Sligo Creek, Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee
2	Kept Private	Anacostia Watershed Society

## *Index by Organization Type*

<b>Org. Type</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Corr. ID</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Civic Organizations</b>				
	Anacostia Watershed Society	6	AL1300	Alternatives: New Elements
			AL1500	Alternative B: Supports Alternative
			AL1900	Vegetative Buffers
			AL2500	Supports Interpretive Signage
			AL2700	Trash Management
			AL3300	Questions Certain Methods
			AL3700	Vegetation
			AL4000	Alternative Elements: Supports Non-Lethal Measures
			AL4100	Alternative Elements: Hydrology
			AL4200	Lethal Control
			AL4300	Alternative Elements: Scare Tactics
			AL4400	Alternative Elements: Fencing
			AL4500	Invasive Species Control
			AL4600	Egg Addling
			AL4700	Cultural Education: Purpose and Need
			WH1100	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat
<b>Conservation/Preservation</b>				
	The Humane Society of the United States	4	AL1100	New Alternatives
			AL3300	Questions Certain Methods
			AL4000	Alternative Elements: Supports Non-Lethal Measures
			AL4300	Alternative Elements: Scare Tactics
			AL4600	Egg Addling
			AL4900	Goose Nest Destruction
			DE1100	Document Edits
<b>Federal Government</b>				
	USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center	7	AL1300	Alternatives: New Elements
			AL3700	Vegetation
			AL4100	Alternative Elements: Hydrology
			AL4400	Alternative Elements: Fencing
			AL4900	Goose Nest Destruction
			PN1100	Purpose and Need: Methods and Assumptions
			PN1300	Purpose and Need: Feasibility
			PN1500	Purpose and Need: Scope of Project
			WH1100	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat
<b>Town/City Government</b>				
	District Department of the Environment	5	AL1500	Alternative B: Supports Alternative
			AL4100	Alternative Elements: Hydrology
			AL4200	Lethal Control
			AL4500	Invasive Species Control
	Anacostia Watershed Society	2	AL1300	Alternatives: New Elements
			AL1500	Alternative B: Supports Alternative
			AL4200	lethal Control



Friends of Sligo Creek, Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee	3	AL1300	Alternatives: New Elements
		AL1500	Alternative B: Supports Alternative
		AL3900	Alternative D: Supports Alternative
Public Stakeholder	1	AL1300	Alternatives: New Elements
		AL3300	Questions Certain Methods
		AL3900	Alternative D: Supports Alternative
		AL4100	Alternative Elements: Hydrology
		AL4300	Alternative Elements: Scare Tactics
		AL4600	Egg Addling
		AL4700	Cultural Education: Purpose and Need
		DE1100	Document Edits
		PN1100	Purpose and Need: Methods and Assumptions
		PN1300	Purpose and Need: Feasibility
		PN1500	Purpose and Need: Scope of Project
		WH1100	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat

### ***Comment Index by Code***

#### **AL1100 - New Alternatives**

The Humane Society of the United States - 4

#### **AL1300 - Alternatives: New Elements**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 2, 6

Friends of Sligo Creek, Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee - 3

Public Stakeholder - 1

USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 7

#### **AL1500 - Alternative B: Supports Alternative**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 2, 6

District Department of the Environment - 5

Friends of Sligo Creek, Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee - 3

#### **AL1900 - Vegetative Buffers**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6

#### **AL2000 - Supports Lethal Reduction of Goose Population**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 2

#### **AL2500 - Supports Interpretive Signage**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6

#### **AL2700 - Trash Management**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6

#### **AL3300 - Questions Certain Methods**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6

Public Stakeholder - 1  
The Humane Society of the United States - 4

**AL3700 - Vegetation**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 7

**AL3900 - Alternative D: Supports Alternative**

Friends of Sligo Creek, Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee - 3  
Public Stakeholder - 1

**AL4000 - Alternative Elements: Supports Non-Lethal Measures**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
The Humane Society of the United States - 4

**AL4100 - Alternative Elements: Hydrology**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
District Department of the Environment - 5  
Public Stakeholder - 1  
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 7

**AL4200 - Lethal Control**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
District Department of the Environment - 5  
The Humane Society of the United States - 4

**AL4300 - Alternative Elements: Scare Tactics**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
Public Stakeholder - 1  
The Humane Society of the United States - 4

**AL4400 - Alternative Elements: Fencing**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 7

**AL4500 - Invasive Species Control**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
District Department of the Environment - 5

**AL4600 - Egg Addling**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
Public Stakeholder - 1  
The Humane Society of the United States - 4

**AL4700 - Cultural Education: Purpose and Need**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
Public Stakeholder - 1

**AL4900 - Goose Nest Destruction**

The Humane Society of the United States - 4  
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 7

**DE1100 - Document Edits**

Public Stakeholder - 1  
The Humane Society of the United States - 4

**PN1100 - Purpose and Need: Methods and Assumptions**

Public Stakeholder - 1  
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 7

**PN1300 - Purpose and Need: Feasibility**

Public Stakeholder - 1  
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 7

**PN1500 - Purpose and Need: Scope of Project**

Public Stakeholder - 1  
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 7

**WH1100 - Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat**

Anacostia Watershed Society - 6  
Public Stakeholder - 1  
USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center - 7