

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Flight 93 National Memorial
Somerset, PA



flight 93



FLIGHT 93 NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Final General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement

National Park Service

June 2007

A FIELD OF HONOR FOREVER

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. §4321-4347) establishes policy, sets goals (section 101), and provides means (section 102) for carrying out that policy. Section 102(2)(C) contains "action-forcing" provisions to ensure that Federal agencies act according to the letter and spirit of the Act. These provisions require that Federal agencies give environmental factors appropriate consideration and weight in decisionmaking. Through a systematic and interdisciplinary approach, Federal agencies shall prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) of the proposed action, assess adverse environmental effects of the action, evaluate alternatives to the action, consider the relationship between local short-term uses and maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and identify any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources should the action be implemented.

*“A common field one day.
A field of honor forever.”*

May all who visit this place remember the collective acts of courage and sacrifice of the passengers and crew, revere this hallowed ground as the final resting place of those heroes, and reflect on the power of individuals who choose to make a difference.

The quote above is from Captain Stephen Ruda, Los Angeles City Fire Department, used to describe the Flight 93 crash site. Ruda wrote the words on a quilted wall hanging sent to the memorial as a tribute to the passengers and crew of Flight 93.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

On Tuesday morning, September 11, 2001, the United States came under attack when four commercial airliners departing from airports on the East Coast were hijacked and used to strike targets on the ground. During the events that ensued, 2,973 people tragically lost their lives as a result of these planned, hostile attacks on this country. Within one hour, two airliners, American Airlines Flight 11, carrying 92 passengers and crew members, and United Airlines Flight 175, carrying 65 passengers and crew, departed Boston's Logan International Airport and were flown into the north and south towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, killing a total of 2,635 people. A third airliner, American Airlines Flight 77, departed Dulles International Airport near Washington, D.C., struck the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia, killing 64 passengers and crew on board and 125 people in the building.

At 8:42 a.m., after a delayed departure, a fourth airliner, United Airlines Flight 93, a Boeing 757 carrying 33 passengers, seven crew members and four hijackers departed Newark International Airport in New Jersey en route to San Francisco, California. Approximately 45 minutes into the flight, the plane changed course near Cleveland, Ohio, and was redirected southeast toward Washington, D.C. After action was taken by the passengers and crew members to overtake the hijackers, Flight 93 crashed a few minutes after 10:00 a.m. into a reclaimed coal strip mine near the town of Shanksville in Somerset County, Pennsylvania. All persons on board were killed and an attack on the nation's capital was thwarted.¹

¹ In November 2002, Congress established the "*National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*", also known as the "*9/11 Commission*." In July 2004, the "*The 9/11 Commission Report*" was published. The report states, "We are sure that the nation owes a debt to the passengers of United Flight 93. Their actions saved the lives of countless others, and may have saved either the U.S. Capitol or the White House from destruction."

Passengers and Crew of United Airlines Flight 93

September 11, 2001

Flight 93 Crew Members

Captain Jason M. Dahl	Littleton, CO
First Officer LeRoy Homer	Marlton, NJ
Lorraine G. Bay, Flight Attendant	East Windsor, NJ
Sandra Bradshaw, Flight Attendant	Greensboro, NC
Wanda Anita Green, Flight Attendant	Oakland, CA/Linden, NJ
CeeCee Lyles, Flight Attendant	Fort Pierce, FL
Deborah Welsh, Flight Attendant	New York City, NY

Passengers

Christian Adams	Biebelsheim, Rheinland-Pfalz, Germany
Todd Beamer	Cranbury, NJ
Alan Anthony Beaven	Oakland, CA
Mark Bingham	San Francisco, CA
Deora Frances Bodley	San Diego, CA
Marion R. Britton	Brooklyn, NY
Thomas E. Burnett, Jr.	Bloomington, MN
William Joseph Cashman	West New York, NJ
Georgine Rose Corrigan	Honolulu, HI
Patricia Cushing	Bayonne, NJ
Joseph DeLuca	Succasunna, NJ
Patrick Joseph Driscoll	Manalapan, NJ
Edward P. Felt	Matawan, NJ
Jane Folger	Bayonne, NJ
Colleen Fraser	Elizabeth, NJ
Andrew Garcia	Portola Valley, CA
Jeremy Glick	Hewitt, NJ
Lauren Catuzzi Grandcolas	San Rafael, CA
Donald Freeman Greene	Greenwich, CT
Linda Gronlund	Greenwood Lake, NY
Kristin White Gould	New York City, NY
Richard Guadagno	Eureka, CA/Trenton, NJ
Toshiya Kuge	Osaka, Japan
Hilda Marcin	Mount Olive, NJ
Waleska Martinez	Jersey City, NJ
Nicole Carol Miller	San Jose, CA
Louis J. Nacke, II	New Hope, PA
Donald Peterson	Spring Lake, NJ
Jean Hoadley Peterson	Spring Lake, NJ
Mark Rothenberg	Scotch Plains, NJ
Christine Snyder	Kailua, HI
John Talignani	Staten Island, NY
Honor Elizabeth Wainio	Baltimore, MD

Executive Summary

The lives of all Americans were changed forever on September 11, 2001. While the nation mourned the loss of life on that day, the selfless act of the passengers and crew of Flight 93 evoked respect and appreciation from people around the world. In the days and weeks following the tragedy, the nation experienced a rekindled sense of unity, strength, and resolve. Actions of the terrorists, intended to divide and demoralize the nation, had the opposite effect, and the crash of Flight 93 became a symbol of courage. The site of the crash became a place of impromptu gathering where the public memorialized and commemorated these events while they struggled to comprehend their meaning.

Following an exhaustive field investigation and recovery effort during the autumn of 2001 by numerous Federal, State and local officials, the crash site was reclaimed. The crater was back-filled and the area was planted with grass and wildflowers. At the same time, county and regional leaders, members of the local community, the families of the passengers and crew of Flight 93, and representatives from the National Park Service began to realize the importance of the crash site as a place of honor and of the need to preserve and protect it. Within six months of the tragic event, federal legislation was introduced to create a national memorial. Congress acted quickly to approve legislation creating the Flight 93 National Memorial.

This plan is an outgrowth of that legislation and its completion is an important step in making the memorial a reality. It proposes a designed memorial landscape that is quiet in reverence, yet powerful in form. It serves as a guide for development and future management of the memorial and a tool for understanding the effects of implementing the design. The plan is the culmination of numerous studies, the collaborative efforts of countless people, and an extensive public process to explore ideas for a fitting memorial tribute.

PROPOSED FEDERAL ACTION

The proposed Federal action would establish a programmatic framework for the memorial that would accomplish the legislative objectives outlined in P.L. 107-226, the *Flight 93 National Memorial Act of 2002*. Creating this framework includes inventorying and assessing the park's resource conditions, establishing preliminary interpretive themes, defining a vision for the

visitor experience and planning for the long-term management and maintenance of a permanent memorial honoring the passengers and crew members of United Airlines Flight 93.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The purpose of this action is to ensure that the Partners – the National Park Service, the Flight 93 Advisory Commission, the Families of Flight 93 and the Flight 93 Memorial Task Force – as well as the public have a clear understanding of the types of development, resource conditions, visitor experiences, and management options that would best fulfill the mission of the Flight 93 National Memorial.

This basic foundation for decisionmaking has been developed with the Partners and other interested stakeholders and is adopted by the National Park Service after an adequate analysis of the benefits, environmental impacts and economic costs of alternative courses of action has been conducted. The need for this action is supported by the existing and projected visitation to the memorial that is expected to increase from approximately 130,000 in 2004, peak at 400,000 in 2011—the 10th anniversary of the September 11th attacks—and level off to about 230,000 visitors throughout the remainder of the 20-year planning horizon.

This action fulfills the authorities and responsibilities extended to the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Service by Congress. This action further provides direction and guidance to the National Park Service in protecting the memorial's resource values and ensuring that respect for the rural landscape and the solemn and tranquil setting of the crash site is maintained in perpetuity.

The Flight 93 National Memorial Act (P.L. 107-226) was enacted on September 24, 2002, only one year from the terrorist attacks. The Act authorized creation of the national memorial and established the Flight 93 Advisory Commission. The Commission was charged with working with the Partners to—

- 1) submit by September 24, 2005, a report to the Secretary of the Interior and Congress containing recommendations on the planning, design, construction and long-term management of a permanent memorial at the crash site;

- 2) advise the Secretary on the boundaries of the memorial site;
- 3) advise the Secretary in the development of a management plan for the memorial site;
- 4) consult and coordinate closely with the Flight 93 Task Force, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and other interested parties, as appropriate, to support and not supplant the efforts of the Flight 93 Task Force on and before the date of the enactment of this Act to commemorate Flight 93; and
- 5) provide significant opportunities for public participation in the planning and design of the Memorial.

In the Act, Congress authorized the National Park Service, through the Secretary of the Interior, to—

- 1) assist the Flight 93 Advisory Commission in providing information on and interpretation of the site, conduct oral history interviews, provide advice on collections, storage and archives;
- 2) assist the Commission in conducting public meetings and forums;
- 3) provide project management assistance to the Commission for the planning, design and construction of the memorial;
- 4) provide programming and design assistance to the Commission for possible memorial exhibits, collections, or activities;
- 5) provide staff support to the Commission and the Flight 93 Task Force;
- 6) participate in the formulation of plans for the design of the memorial, to accept funds raised by the Commission for construction of the memorial and to construct the memorial;
- 7) acquire from willing sellers the land or interest in the land for the memorial site by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange; and
- 8) administer the Flight 93 National Memorial as a unit of the national park system in accordance with applicable laws and policies.

FOUNDATION FOR PLANNING AND DECISIONMAKING

The Partners agreed that all development and management decisions should be guided by a Mission Statement. Through a collaborative process involving several months of workshops, an online forum, and distribution of a project newsletter and public comment form, the Partners drafted a Mission Statement to guide and ground all aspects of the project.

Mission

The Partners summarized the Mission of the national memorial in several statements. The *mission* of the Flight 93 National Memorial is to—

- 1) honor the heroism, courage and enduring sacrifice of the passengers and crew of United Airlines Flight 93;
- 2) revere this hallowed ground as the final resting place of heroes who sacrificed their lives so that other would be spared;
- 3) remember and commemorate the events of September 11, 2001;
- 4) celebrate the lives of the passengers and crew of Flight 93;
- 5) express the appreciation of a grateful nation forever changed by the events of September 11, 2001;
- 6) educate visitors about the context of the events of September 11, 2001; and
- 7) offer a place of comfort, hope and inspiration.

Statement of Purpose

On September 24, 2002, the *Flight 93 National Memorial Act* (P.L. 107-226) was enacted, creating the Flight 93 National Memorial. The following statements represent shared understandings about the purposes for creating the memorial:

- Honor the passengers and crew members of Flight 93 who courageously gave their lives, thereby thwarting a planned attack on Washington, D.C.
- Allow the public to visit the site and express their feelings about the event and the passengers and crew of Flight 93
- Respect the rural landscape and preserve the solemn and tranquil setting of the crash site of Flight 93

Statement of Significance

The events of September 11, 2001, and the dramatic story of Flight 93 are forever linked to the rural Pennsylvania field on which the crash occurred. The following statements summarize the significance and national importance of this site and explain why it was selected as the site of a national memorial:

- The crash site is the final resting place of the passengers and crew of Flight 93.
- The heroic actions of the passengers and crew of Flight 93 are part of the transformational events of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States.

Fundamental Resources and Values

The National Park Service and the Partners identified those resources and values that are most essential for achieving the purpose and mission of the memorial. These fundamental resources will help ensure that planning and management decisions are focused on the most significant values of the memorial and include: 1) the crash site, 2) the hemlock grove, and 3) the viewshed and setting of the memorial.

PLANNING PROCESS AND IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES

The Partners adopted a process for developing the recommendations required by the Act. This process ensures all Partners and the public are involved in decision-making throughout the project and that all mandates for planning a new unit of the national park system are met. The National Park Service is the lead public agency in planning, designing and constructing the national memorial.

The process grounds the design and management recommendations in the Mission Statement and pursues a design competition and the creation of this management plan to produce recommendations that are consistent and well-informed. The process offers transparency and provides local residents, the public, and other government agencies with many and varied opportunities to actively participate in the creation of the national memorial. The complete process is described in Chapter I.

The National Park Service initiated formal scoping — identifying issues of concern early in the process — on December 10, 2003, when a Notice of Intent to Prepare a General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/EIS) was published in the Federal Register (68 FR 68947-68948). The issues identified by agencies and the public during this process are described in Chapter I and include:

- **Local community and lifestyle impacts**, including traffic on local roadways and access to the site, changes to local tax base and school district tax revenue, and restrictions on traditional uses (i.e. hunting and ATV use) of the site;
- **Adjacent development** and its impact on the visitor experience and the rural setting for the national memorial;
- **Development challenges** such as the presence of hazardous materials, geotechnical constraints, and the ability to provide

adequate potable drinking water and sewerage systems;

- **Noise impacts** on the experience of visitors from sources such as adjacent land uses and aircraft overflights;
- **Private Sorber family cemetery** located within the boundary and the need to protect it as the memorial is created;
- **Security and public safety**; and
- **Accommodating visitation levels**, particularly during commemorations, without affecting the solemn environment, visitor experience and the site's resources.

BOUNDARY

Determining the boundary for the Flight 93 National Memorial has been the culmination of nearly two years of resource and viewshed studies, site visits, computer modeling, and public input. The Partners concluded that the memorial boundary should include:

- 1) the crash site, including the adjacent debris field and the extent where human remains were found, are the most important resources at the site;
- 2) the immediate lands for visitors to view the crash site, as well as areas necessary for visitor access and facilities; and
- 3) lands necessary to provide an appropriate setting for the memorial.

As a result of collaborative efforts, the Flight 93 Advisory Commission signed Resolution 0401 recommending a boundary for the new national memorial on July 30, 2004. The Secretary of the Interior approved this recommendation on January 14, 2005. The total area within the boundary is composed of approximately 2,200 acres, of which about 1,355 acres include the crash site, the debris field and the area where human remains were found, and those lands necessary for visiting the national memorial. Lands that would provide for access to the site from U.S. Route 30 are also included. An additional 907 acres would comprise the perimeter viewshed around the core visitor lands. Ideally, these lands would remain in private ownership and be protected with partners through less-than-fee means, such as conservation or scenic easements. Although as of the public release of this draft document all lands within the memorial boundary are in private ownership, the actions presented in this plan assume eventual Federal ownership of the core lands and protection of the perimeter viewshed through partnerships with other land owners.

MEMORIAL DESIGN COMPETITION

The Partners agreed that an open design competition would be the most inclusive, transparent and democratic way to explore a range of designs for a national memorial. The competition was open to design professionals, as well as to the public, and was conducted in two stages. Stage I of the memorial design competition opened on September 11, 2004, and closed on January 11, 2005. The design competition was sponsored by the Partners with financial support from the Heinz Endowments and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation.

The competition guidelines challenged the competitors to present concepts for a “memorial expression” that portrayed the issues, ideas, and passions contained in the Mission Statement. All competitors were requested to consider the following themes in their concepts. These themes represented the Partners’ objectives:

- Honor the heroes of Flight 93—the 40 passengers and crew who on one September morning changed the course of history...;
- Contribute to the dialogue of what a national memorial should be...;
- Conceive a message that will reflect on the event that occurred on September 11, 2001 and be timeless in its power and conviction....

More than 1,000 entries were received for Stage I of the competition. The public had the opportunity to review and comment on all entries at an open exhibition in Somerset, Pennsylvania, and through the Internet at an online exhibit on the project website. An independent jury of family members and design professionals reviewed all designs and public comments, and on February 4, 2005, five finalists whose design concepts were determined to best meet the Mission Statement were selected to proceed to Stage II of the competition.

The Stage II finalists were requested to refine their designs to fully explain their concepts and to present their refinements by June 15, 2005. These refined concepts were exhibited for public comment in Somerset, Pennsylvania, and on the project website between July 1 and September 25, 2005. A separate jury of noted design professionals, family members, and community leaders reviewed the public comments and evaluated the designs against the memorial’s Mission Statement. On September 7, 2005, the Flight 93 Advisory Commission announced the final selected design to the public. This design is described in Alternative 2 – Preferred Final Design and is evaluated fully in this document.

ALTERNATIVES

The Partners and the public explored a range of alternatives for developing the memorial. Some ideas were initially considered but were eliminated from further evaluation due to the infeasibility of the design and its inability to meet the Mission Statement. These alternatives are briefly discussed in Chapter II – Alternatives, along with the two alternatives under evaluation in this plan: Alternative 1 – No Action, which considers the effects of operating and maintaining the memorial under current management practices with some minor modifications related to visitor safety and convenience, and Alternative 2-Preferred Design Alternative, which evaluates the effects of developing the memorial based on the final design from the international design competition. Alternative 2 also represents the agency’s preferred alternative, as well as the environmentally preferred alternative.

Alternative 1 – No Action

The No Action Alternative assesses how the memorial would be maintained under the current management direction. It would not freeze all activity at the site. No visitor center or ancillary facilities would be developed. Projected visitation to the site would be expected to decline and average about 87,000 visitors per year. The estimated cost of development for this alternative would be approximately \$450,000. Roadway improvements along Skyline Road (approximately \$2.1 million) would be borne primarily by Stonycreek Township with expected anticipated funding from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Estimated staff and operating costs would be \$750,000 with up to eight full-time staff persons.

The National Park Service would acquire approximately 657 acres in fee for resource protection and visitor use. The remaining 1,605 acres would be acquired through less-than-fee means such as easements, and would be a lesser priority. Based on 2005 estimates, the cost for acquiring this land and for relocations is approximately \$8 million.

Alternative 2 – Preferred Design Alternative (Agency’s Preferred and Environmentally Preferred Alternative)

Alternative 2 proposes to transform the reclaimed mining site into a memorial landscape based upon the selected design from the international design competition as adopted by the Partners. This alternative would involve full development of the site and implement the selected design, which would include construction

of an 8,000-square-foot visitor facility. Access to the site would be provided by construction of a new entrance directly from U.S. Route 30. With development of this alternative, visitation to the memorial is expected to peak at about 400,000 visitors during the 10th anniversary (2011) of the terrorist attacks and stabilize to about 230,000 visitors per year over the long term.

Approximately 14 full-time employees are anticipated to administer, operate and maintain the memorial. Total operating costs are estimated at about \$1 million a year. Alternative 2 proposes acquisition of about 1,355 acres in fee for resource protection and visitor use and another 907 acres for viewshed protection that would ideally be in partnerships with landowners, conservation groups and other land owners through mechanisms such as conservation or scenic easements. Based on 2005 land values, land acquisition costs for Alternative 2 are estimated at \$10 million.

Summary of Alternatives

Selection of Alternative 1 would minimally meet the goals identified in the Mission Statement (see Chapter I). Local volunteers would continue to greet visitors, provide site and resource interpretation, and support minimal maintenance at the Temporary Memorial. Although development costs would be significantly lower than those for Alternative 2, there would be no visitor facilities, no formal interpretive program and no public education or outreach programs. Visitors would continue to experience the site in the open without a visitor facility. In addition, visitors would also be limited to the area where the Temporary Memorial is currently located and would not be permitted to gain closer access to the crash site. Local residents would continue to experience the annoyances and

unsafe conditions of visitors traveling along narrow, local roads.

The cost of improving and upgrading Skyline Road to support buses and additional traffic would be incurred by Stonycreek Township with support from PennDOT. Significant improvements would also be needed to Lambertsville and Buckstown Roads to safely accommodate visitor traffic. The site would be subjected to potential impacts that could be induced by incompatible development adjacent to the site and along the U.S. Route 30 corridor.

Selection of Alternative 2 would more fully meet the goals of the Flight 93 National Memorial's Mission Statement, as well as the purpose and intent of the *Flight 93 National Memorial Act* by creating a designed memorial landscape. A new visitor facility is proposed under this alternative to provide for interpretive exhibits, public education and outreach, and visitor services. The public would have a broader range of opportunities to learn about the deeds of 40 passengers and crew members and the events that occurred on September 11, 2001. Alternative 2 would provide a venue for visitors to get closer to the crash site and would place a greater emphasis on providing an appropriate setting for the memorial and a more contemplative visitor experience.

Under Alternative 2, visitor-related traffic would no longer access the memorial by use of local roads, such as Lambertsville Road and Buckstown Road. Although the construction costs would be higher to build the memorial features and the related infrastructure than for Alternative 1, they would be shared through a partnership involving the public, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government. A comparison of these costs by alternative is shown in Table ES-1.

Table ES-1: Summary of Estimated Development and Operating Costs for Flight 93 National Memorial by Alternative

Costs*	Alternative 1 – No Action	Alternative 2 – Preferred Design Alternative
Development Costs** (Memorial Feature, Visitor Center, Utilities, Roads and Parking)	\$450,000	\$44.7 million
Annual Operating Costs (Employees and Operations)	\$750,000	\$1 million
Land Acquisition	\$8 million (657 acres fee; 1,605 acres easements)	\$10 million (1,355 acres fee; 907 acres easements)

* These costs are based on 2005 estimates and represent gross costs for planning and comparison purposes only. Actual costs will be developed through the design development process. Development of any proposed facilities and infrastructure is dependent on the availability of funding.

** Estimated \$2.1 million cost to upgrade Skyline Road would be borne primarily by Stonycreek Township, with assistance anticipated from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Extensive improvements to Lambertsville and Buckstown Roads would also be necessary.

Source: National Park Service, 2005.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Numerous technical studies and resource surveys were conducted during the planning process to determine the potential effects of implementing each alternative. Table ES-2 presents the resource categories relevant to Flight

93 National Memorial. Through an evaluation process and agency consultation, impacts on these resources were assessed by alternative. Table ES-2 represents the levels of magnitude by alternative on the specific resources.

Impact Category	Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Preferred Design Alternative*
Natural Resources:		
Geology, Soils & Topography	Negligible	Minor
Vegetation & Wildlife	Minor	Minor
Federally & State Protected Species	Negligible	Minor
Water Resources:		
Wetlands	Negligible	Moderate
Surface Waters & Water Quality	Negligible	Minor
Historic and Cultural Resources	Minor	Minor
Socioeconomic Impacts:	Major	Moderate
Potable Water Supplies and Sewage Containment	Negligible	Minor
Land Uses	Major	Moderate
Transportation	Major	Moderate
Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential	Negligible	Minor
Visual and Aesthetic Resources	Negligible	Moderate
Public Health & Safety	Minor	Moderate
<small>Note: Negligible=No effect or minor effect; Minor=Measurable but with minimal effect to resources; Moderate=Changes to resource conditions but not irreversible or can be mitigated; and Major=Resource conditions are changed irreversibly affected even with mitigation. Source: Compiled by National Park Service, 2006.</small>		

PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

Formal planning for the memorial was initiated on December 10, 2003, with the publication of a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (68 FR 68947), followed by a series of agency and public scoping meetings that were conducted during 2003-2005. Chapter I includes an overview of the planning and public involvement process. This process culminated in the publication of the Draft GMP/EIS in June 2006 and a 60-day public comment period. On June 16, 2006, a “Notice of Availability” announcing the availability of the Draft Flight 93 National Memorial GMP/EIS was published in the *Federal Register* (71 FR 34964). Comments were accepted on the Draft GMP/EIS until August 15, 2006.

In addition to the formal *Federal Register* announcement, media releases and a newsletter were widely distributed announcing the availability of the document. Broad electronic messaging through email and online through the Flight 93 National Memorial project website was conducted to advise the public and agencies about the availability of the document and the 60-day public comment period. Printed copies of the document were also available upon request.

A public hearing in the format of an open house workshop was conducted on July 20, 2006, at the Shanksville-Stonycreek School in Shanksville,

Pennsylvania. The purpose of the public hearing and public comment period was to provide agencies and the public with an opportunity to submit comments on the technical accuracy and adequacy of the Draft GMP/EIS, and on the alternatives to the proposed action.

Approximately 1,452 comments were received on the Draft GMP/EIS during the 60-day comment period and at the public hearing. No agencies expressed concerns or identified significant impacts that potentially could result from the proposed action. Subsequent to its review, EPA assigned the project a rating of “LO,” which means Lack of Objections and the agency has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the preferred alternative. Appendix J summarizes agency and other substantive comments received on the Draft GMP/EIS, as well as summarizes comments unrelated to the NEPA analysis. These comments pertained to personal preferences for or opposed to the design selected for the memorial, general support for or opposition to the project, and a request by a former design competitor to be included in the attribution of the selected design. These comments are included in a separate compendium of comments that may be obtained from the National Park Service upon request.