

**APPENDIX C – RECORD OF NEPA/NHPA/ESA COMPLIANCE****UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE****RECORD OF DECISION****FINAL POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE FIRE MANAGEMENT PLAN/  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT****Point Reyes National Seashore  
Marin County, California**

The Department of Interior, National Park Service (NPS) has prepared this Record of Decision on the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS* for Point Reyes National Seashore (PRNS) and North District of Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). The North District of GGNRA is administered by Point Reyes National Seashore. This Record of Decision includes a description of the background for the project, a statement of the decision made, synopses of other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, findings on impairment of park resources and values, a description of the environmentally preferable alternative, a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm, and an overview of public and agency involvement in the decision-making process.

**BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT**

This revision of the Fire Management Plan (FMP) was initiated in 2000 because of changes to NPS and federal fire management policy and to bring about needed refinements to the program, as indicated by research and monitoring that has been ongoing since the earliest days of fire program implementation.

Fire management planning and programs have been ongoing since 1970, when NPS fire management policy was changed to allow natural processes to occur when possible. Refinements have been made to the PRNS fire management program, and will continue to be made as knowledge of fire ecology and fire behavior increases. The previous revision to the FMP was completed in 1993. Fire management is an integral part of the park's natural and cultural resources management program. The FMP will assist in achieving land management objectives that are defined in the 1993 Resources Management Plan.

The planning area for the FMP includes NPS lands located approximately 40 miles northwest of San Francisco in Marin County, California. These lands include the 70,046-acre Point Reyes National Seashore, comprised primarily of beaches, coastal headlands, extensive freshwater and estuarine wetlands, marine terraces, and forests, as well as 18,000 acres of the Northern District of GGNRA, primarily supporting annual grasslands, coastal scrub, and Douglas-fir and coast redwood forests.

## APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

The purpose of the FMP is to provide a framework for all fire management activities for the Seashore and the North District of GGNRA, including suppression of unplanned ignitions, prescribed fire, and mechanical fuels treatments. It is intended to guide the fire management program for approximately the next 10-15 years. The plan would include concise program objectives, details on staffing and equipment, and comprehensive information, guidelines, and protocols relating to the management of unplanned wildfire, prescribed burning, and mechanical fuels treatment.

Fire management is an essential component of NPS operations in PRNS and the Northern District lands of GGNRA. The need for a well-planned and effective fire management program is threefold. First, the project area's ecosystems have evolved through time with the periodic occurrence of fires, both natural and human-ignited, and many components of these systems require the continuation of periodic fire. As is typical of many national parks and other federal lands, however, active and effective fire suppression efforts for the past 150 years have dramatically changed native ecosystems. Ecosystem changes from the lack of fire include forest and shrub encroachment on grasslands, decadence and death of fire-adapted species, and extremely dense forests.

Second, fire suppression has also resulted in a dangerous accumulation of flammable or hazardous fuels - large quantities of dead and downed trees and branches that have accumulated in overly dense forests and shrublands. Because of these high fuel loads, residences and businesses adjacent to the PRNS and GGNRA are at risk from catastrophic wildfire or a smaller fire spreading from adjacent parklands. Also, a structural fire close to the park could spread into federal lands and develop into a wildland fire that damages park resources.

Third, the park's existing Fire Management Plan (NPS, 1993) needs to be updated. Since the current FMP was published in 1993, the national fire policies have been updated and new guidelines have been issued to park units. In addition, the NPS has conducted fire research and now has a better understanding of the role of fire in ecosystem preservation, resulting in a greater capability of the PRNS to conduct an effective fire program. Updating also allows PRNS to focus more heavily on effectively reducing fire risk along the wildland/urban interface, reducing hazardous fuels, and reestablishing fire in park ecosystems where it is safe to do so.

The following goals have been developed for the updated Fire Management Plan for PRNS and the Northern District lands of GGNRA. These goals were generated from internal staff meetings and public external scoping meetings and presentations, and from review of NPS Policies, Director's Orders, and other fire-related guidance documents listed below.

- Goal 1: Protect firefighters and the public.
- Goal 2: Protect private and public property.
- Goal 3: Maintain or improve conditions of natural resources and protect these resources from adverse impacts of wildland fire and fire management practices.
- Goal 4: Maximize efforts to protect cultural resources from adverse effects of wildland fire and fire management practices.
- Goal 5: Foster and maintain effective community and interagency fire management partnerships.

## APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

Goal 6: Foster a high degree of understanding of fire and fuels management among park employees, neighbors, and visitors.

Goal 7: Improve knowledge and understanding of fire through research and monitoring and continue to refine fire management practices.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement identifies and evaluates three alternatives for a FMP for Point Reyes National Seashore administered lands. Potential impacts and appropriate mitigation are assessed for each alternative. The Fire Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FMP/FEIS) documents the analyses of two action alternatives, and a “no action” alternative.

**DECISION (SELECTED ACTION)**

Alternative C is the selected action in the final FMP/FEIS and remains unchanged from the draft EIS. Under Alternative C, Increased Natural Resource Enhancement and Expanded Hazardous Fuel Reduction, fire management actions will be used to markedly increase efforts to benefit natural resources and reduce hazardous fuels. This alternative includes objectives for increasing the abundance and distribution of federally listed species, reducing infestations of invasive, non-native plants and increasing native plant cover. Prescribed burning and mechanical treatments will be used to protect or benefit cultural resources, such as reducing vegetation in areas identified as important historic viewsheds.

Alternative C permits the highest number of acres treated annually for hazardous fuels reduction concentrating on high priority areas (e.g., along road corridors, around structures, and in strategic areas to create fuel breaks). Up to 3,500 acres could be treated per year using prescribed fire and mechanical treatments. Under this alternative, research efforts will be expanded to determine the effects of fire on natural resources of concern (e.g., rare and non-native species) and to determine the effectiveness of various treatments for fuel reduction. Research results will be used adaptively to guide the fire management program in maximizing benefits to natural resources, while protecting lives and property.

This alternative will reduce the threat of a catastrophic wildland fire to a more stable fire condition at Year 13 of implementation rather than Year 23 as in Alternative B or indefinite extension of the program under Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. Ten of eleven Fire Management Units (FMUs) will be treated under Alternative C; the eleventh FMU – the Minimum Management FMU – is primarily leased for agriculture and is subject to defensible space and roadside clearing under all three alternatives. As documented in the final EIS, Alternative C was also deemed to be the “Environmentally Preferred” Alternative. This alternative also provides the greatest protection to designated wilderness by ensuring long-term ecological health.

To ensure that implementation of fire management plan actions described in Alternative C conform to findings of this impact assessment, subsequent five year fuels treatment plans and individual projects when appropriate will be subject to NPS project review. Prior to approval, projects will be submitted through an NPS internal review process wherein an interdisciplinary team will evaluate if the potential effects of the proposed projects are adequately addressed

## APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

through the FMP NEPA process. Conformance to the conclusions in the FMP EIS will be documented for the NEPA record. If the team finds that the project has major new environmental effects not addressed in this EIS or effects greater than those described in this EIS, a separate environmental process will be conducted. In addition, as part of the project review process, projects carried out in designated wilderness will be required to go through a minimum requirement process. In this two step process, the park must: 1. make a determination as to whether or not a propose management action is appropriate or necessary for the administration of the park as wilderness; and 2. if the project or activity is appropriate in wilderness, make a selection of the management method/tool that causes the least impact on the physical resource and experiential qualities of wilderness.

**OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The final FMP/FEIS analyzes two other alternatives. Alternative A, Continued Fuel Reduction for Public Safety and Limited Resource Enhancement, is the No Action Alternative representing the current fire management program. The current program uses a limited range of fire management strategies - including prescribed fire, mechanical treatment, and suppression of all wildland fires, including natural ignitions. Alternative A would continue the existing program described in the 1993 Fire Management Plan including mechanical treatments of hazardous fuels of up to 500 acres per year, primarily mowing in grasslands. Up to 500 acres per year would be treated by prescribed burning, primarily for fuel reduction in grasslands and for Scotch and French broom control. Total treatments per year will not exceed 1,000 acres. Research projects already in progress on reducing Scotch broom and velvet grass through prescribed burning would continue under this alternative. In continuing current practices, treatments would occur in four of eleven FMUs sited along the primary roadways. This program does not place emphasis on wildland/urban interface communities.

Alternative B - Expanded Hazardous Fuel Reduction and Additional Natural Resource Enhancement. Alternative B calls for a substantial increase over present levels in the reduction of hazardous fuels through prescribed burning and mechanical treatments (up to a combined total of 2,000 acres treated per year). Efforts would be concentrated where unplanned ignitions will be most likely to occur (e.g., road corridors), and where defensible space could most effectively contain unplanned ignitions and protect lives and property (e.g., around structures and strategically along the park interface zone). Natural resource benefits would accrue as a secondary objective only. For example, prescribed burning to reduce fuels may have the secondary resource benefit of controlling a flammable, invasive non-native plant. Fire management actions would occur in nine of eleven FMUs with no projects occurring at the low grasslands within the Headlands FMU or in the Minimum Management FMU. Assuming full annual implementation, a stable fire condition with a lowered potential for a catastrophic fire such as the 1995 Vision Fire, could be achieved by Year 23 of plan implementation.

APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

**BASIS FOR DECISION**

After careful consideration of the alternatives presented, their environmental impacts, planning goals, and public comments received throughout the planning process, including comments on the *Draft Fire Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement*, Alternative C has been selected for implementation. This alternative best accomplishes National Park Service and Federal fire management policy, the legislated purpose of PRNS and GGNRA, and the statutory mission of the National Park Service to provide long-term protection of park resources. The selected action also best accomplishes the stated purposes of the Fire Management Plan (as described on page 1-5, in the Purpose and Need Chapter, of the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*, and the criteria derived from these purposes. An analysis of the selected alternative’s relationship to these goals is presented below.

Range of FMP Alternatives Compared by Fire Management Goals

| Goals   | Alt. A | Alt. B | Alt. C |
|---|--------|--------|--------|
| Protect firefighters and the public   | 2      | 2      | 3      |
| Protect private and public property   | 1      | 2      | 3      |
| Maintain or improve conditions of natural resources and protect these resources from adverse impacts of wildland fire and fire management practices | 2      | 2      | 3      |
| Maximize efforts to protect cultural resources from adverse effects of wildland fire and fire management practices                                  | 2      | 3      | 3      |
| Foster and maintain effective community and interagency fire management partnerships  | 3      | 3      | 3      |
| Foster a high degree of understanding of fire and fuels management among park employees, neighbors, and visitors                                    | 2      | 3      | 3      |
| Improve knowledge and understanding of fire through research and monitoring and continue to refine fire management practices                        | 2      | 2      | 3      |

- 1 - Partially Meets Goal
- 2 –Meets Basic Level of Goal
- 3 –Provides Highest Levels of Goal Achievement

**ENVIROMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

National Park Service policy regarding implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that an environmentally preferred alternative be identified in all NEPA analysis documents. Determination of this alternative takes place after the environmental analysis is complete. The environmentally preferred alternative is the alternative that best promotes the national environmental policy expressed in Section 101 of NEPA. This includes

## APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

alternatives that would:

- fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
- assure for all visitors a safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
- attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk of health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
- preserve important historic, cultural and natural aspects of our national heritage and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;
- achieve a balance of population and resource use which would permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and
- enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

Essentially, this means the environmentally preferred alternative is the one that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment or most naturally perpetuates biological or physical process; it also means the alternative which is best suited to protect, preserve, and enhance historic, cultural and natural resources and process. After analyzing the alternatives described in this FEIS, the NPS has determined that Alternative C is environmentally preferred. Alternative C includes fire management treatments that would provide a high level of protection of human health, life and property, while maximizing efforts toward restoring and maintaining ecological integrity, and protecting and enhancing cultural resources (e.g., preserving important historic, cultural and natural aspects of our national heritage). Although Alternative B also would provide a high level of protection of life and property, it would not provide the same benefits to natural and cultural resources. Of the three alternatives, Alternative A (No Action) would provide the lowest degree of protection of lives and property, and minimal benefits to natural and cultural resources.

## FINDINGS ON IMPAIRMENT OF PARK RESOURCES AND VALUES

The NPS has determined that implementation of Alternative C from the *Fire Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* will not constitute an impairment to park resources and values. This conclusion is based on a thorough analysis of the environmental impacts described in the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*, the public comments received, relevant scientific studies, and the professional judgment of the decision-maker guided by the direction in Management Policy. While the plan has some negative impacts, in all cases these adverse impacts are the result of actions to preserve and restore park resources and values. Overall, the plan results in major benefits to park resources and values, and it does not result in their impairment.

In determining whether impairment may occur, park managers consider the duration, severity, and magnitude of the impact; the resources and values affected; and direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the action. According to NPS Policy, "An impact would be more likely to constitute an impairment to the extent that it affects a resource or value whose conservation is: necessary to fulfill specific purposes identified in the establishing legislation or proclamation of

## APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

the park; key to the natural or cultural integrity of the park or to opportunities for enjoyment of the park; or identified as a goal in the park's general management plan or other relevant National Park Service planning documents.” (NPS Management Policies, Part 1.4.5, 2001)

The non-impairment policy does not prohibit impacts to park resources and values. The NPS has the discretion to allow impacts to park resources and values when necessary and appropriate to fulfill the purposes of a park, so long as the impacts do not constitute impairment. Moreover, an impact is less likely to constitute impairment if it is an unavoidable result of an action necessary to preserve or restore the integrity of park resources or values.

This decision is made based on guidance contained in the NPS Management Policies (2001). The decision to implement Alternative C will result in a greater level of accomplishment of the goals of the fire management program, with the potential for reversing the departure from natural fire return intervals. If annual accomplishment rates and funding can be maintained, Alternative C would achieve ecosystem restoration and wildland/urban interface protection, and would do so with lesser on-site impacts than under Alternative B. The potential for high-intensity catastrophic fire that would put high-value at risk would be greatly reduced under the selected alternative.

The combination of the use of mechanical thinning techniques and prescribed fire in the inner wildland urban interface, and the use of prescribed fire in the outer wildland urban interface will provide a defense in depth against unwanted wildland fires. The restoration of wildland fire where this can be safely done will also reduce the extent of unnaturally dense accumulations of wildland fuels which pose a risk to natural and cultural resources, as well as to public safety and communities.

In conclusion, the NPS has determined that the implementation of Alternative C will not result in impairment of resources and values in PRNS and GGNRA North District. This conclusion is documented in the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*.

## MEASURES TO MINIMIZE ENVIRONMENTAL HARM

The NPS has investigated all practical means to avoid or minimize environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the selected action. The measures have been incorporated into Alternative C, and are presented in detail in the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*.

A consistent set of mitigation measures would be applied to actions that result from this plan (see Appendix A). Fire monitoring by the Fire Management Staff and Resource Management programs will be implemented to detect deleterious results. These results from this program will guide and assure compliance monitoring, biological and cultural resource protection, noxious weed control, visitor safety and fire education, endangered, threatened and special status species protection, and other mitigation.

Mitigation measures will also be applied to future actions that are guided by this plan. In addition, the National Park Service will prepare appropriate compliance reviews, i.e., National Environmental Policy Act, National Historic Preservation, and other relevant legislation for

## APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

future actions not covered under this EIS, including projects in wilderness involving mechanical treatments or prescribed fire.

**PUBLIC AND INTERAGENCY INVOLVEMENT**

During a series of scoping meetings, the NPS requested input from the public, from federal, state, and local agencies, and from park resource specialists on fire management concerns, the types of issues that should be addressed in the EIS, and the range of fire management alternative strategies that should be considered.

On January 27, 2000, a “Notice of Scoping for Fire Management Plan at Point Reyes National Seashore” was published in the Federal Register. On January 29, 2000, at a public meeting of the Point Reyes National Seashore Citizen Advisory Commission, a presentation was given announcing the scoping period for the plan. Scoping comments were solicited from January 27, 2000 to March 28, 2000.

On February 14, 2000 and on February 22, 2000, internal scoping sessions were conducted to identify staff issues and concerns. These meetings were attended by an interdisciplinary group of resource and fire specialists from the PRNS and GGNRA staff.

In addition to the Federal Register Notice, the scoping period was publicized through a mass mailing to the public that included background information on the FMP and a notice of a scoping workshop held March 9, 2000. Notices posted in the communities surrounding the park and a notice in the local weekly newspaper, the Point Reyes Light, also advertised the workshop. The two-hour March 9, 2000 public scoping workshop was attended by five citizens.

On March 28, 2000, a two-hour scoping session was held for local fire agencies. In addition to representatives of the NPS Fire Management Office, members of the Marin County Fire Department, Inverness Volunteer Fire Department, California State Parks, and Marin Municipal Water District were in attendance. Also invited, but not attending, were the Marin County Open Space District, Bolinas Fire Protection District, Nicasio Volunteer Fire Department, and Stinson Beach Fire Department.

In spring of 2001, the NPS conducted a two-hour meeting to provide an overview to the Marin County Fire Department of the preliminary alternatives, and consulted on possible changes and/or modifications.

The draft EIS for the Fire Management Plan was released for public comment on February 20, 2004 when EPA filing notice occurred. The Notice of Availability (NOA) was published on February 25, 2004. The draft EIS was placed on the park website during the comment period and notices of its availability were sent to over 200 interested parties including agencies and organizations. Fifteen copies of the draft EIS were sent to the State of California Clearinghouse for state agencies on February 24, 2004 for review. Copies were also distributed to all local libraries, the central Marin County Library and the San Francisco Public Library. Approximately 12 copies of the draft EIS were sent to interested parties. A public meeting was held at Point Reyes National Seashore on March 18, 2004; approximately 15 people attended. The comment period closed April 20, 2004. Seven written comment letters were received; they are addressed below.

## APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria have been consulted for compliance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. A letter was sent to the tribe on February 19, 2004. Consultation will continue for each specific project when appropriate.

The Environmental Protection Agency reviewed the draft FMP/EIS and rated it LO—Lack of Objections and supported the NPS selection of Alternative C with a few minor corrections that were made in the FEIS.

Documentation of NPS compliance with federal and state laws and regulations is incorporated into the text of the FEIS. Compliance with the major federal laws and associated state regulations is summarized here.

Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, PL 93-205, 87 Stat. 884, 16 USC §1531 et seq. The Act protects threatened and endangered species, as listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), from unauthorized take, and directs federal agencies to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of such species. Section 7 of the Act defines federal agency responsibilities for consultation with the USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and requires preparation of a Biological Assessment to identify any threatened or endangered species that is likely to be affected by the proposed action. The National Park Service initiated consultation on February 9, 2001 and continued with the USFWS and the NMFS.

The NMFS Biological Assessment, dated May 17, 2004, concurred with the NPS finding of not likely to adversely affect threatened steelhead and threatened coho salmon. The NMFS BA has been incorporated in the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*.

The USFWS Biological Opinion, dated May 28, 2004, has been incorporated into the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*. The USFWS concurred that the actions in Alternative C will not likely to adversely affect the following federally listed species: western snowy plover, northern spotted owl, Sonoma alopecurus, Sonoma spineflower, Tiburon paintbrush, beach layia, Tidestrom's lupine, Marin dwarf, and California freshwater shrimp. Regarding the federally-listed Myrtle silverspot butterfly and the California red-legged frog, the USFWS did not concur with the not likely to adverse affect determination, but concluded that the proposed project will result in significant long-term benefits to these two listed species and the proposed critical habitat, and any adverse effects will be minor and temporary in nature. The PRNS has agreed to additional mitigation measures proposed by USFWS and they have been incorporated in the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*.

Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, PL 96-95, 93 Stat. 712, 16 USC §470aa et seq. and 43 CFR 7, subparts A and B, 36 CFR. This Act secures the protection of archeological resources on public or Indian lands and fosters increased cooperation and exchange of information between private, government, and the professional community in order to facilitate the enforcement and education of present and future generations. It regulates excavation and collection on public and Indian lands. It requires notification of Indian tribes who may consider a site of religious or cultural importance prior to issuing a permit. The NPS will meet its obligations under this Act in all activities conducted in the Fire Management Plan.

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, PL 89-665, 80 Stat. 915, 16 USC §470 et seq. and 36 CFR 18, 60, 61, 63, 68, 79, 800. The National Historic Preservation Act requires

## APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

agencies to take into account the effects of their actions on properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has developed implementing regulations (36 CFR 800), which allow agencies to develop agreements for consideration of these historic properties. The NPS, in consultation with the Advisory Council, the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), American Indian tribes, and the public has developed a Programmatic Agreement for operations and maintenance activities on historic structures. This Programmatic Agreement provides a process for compliance with National Historic Preservation Act, and includes stipulations for identification, evaluation, treatment, and mitigation of adverse effects for actions affecting historic properties. The NPS sent a scoping notice and the Draft Fire Management Plan/EIS to the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation. No response or comments were received from these offices.

American Indian Religious Freedom Act, PL 95-341, 92 Stat. 469, 42 USC §1996. This act declares policy to protect and preserve the inherent and constitutional right of the American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut, and Native Hawaiian people to believe, express, and exercise their traditional religions. It provides that religious concerns should be accommodated or addressed under NEPA or other appropriate statutes. The National Park Service, as a matter of policy, will be as nonrestrictive in permitting Native American access to and use of an identified traditional sacred resource for traditional ceremonies.

**Comments Received Following Release of the Final EIS**

The Notice of Availability for the Final EIS was published in the Federal Register on August 31, 2004; EPA's Notice of Filing was posted on September 10, 2004 formally initiated the No Action Period which concluded on October 12, 2004. The Final EIS was placed on the park website during the no-action period and notices of its availability were sent to over 200 interested parties including agencies and organizations. Copies of the Final EIS were requested by, and distributed to, the San Francisco Main Public Library, State of California Department of Fish and Game, and Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Two individual letters of comment were received regarding the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*. These letters expressed general concern about prescribed burning, but did not have specific comments that could be addressed.

**CHANGES MADE FOR THE FINAL FIRE MANAGEMENT PLAN/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

A number of minor changes were made in the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*, based on public comment period for the draft EIS. During the review of the draft EIS, only seven written comments were received. Four letters were from agencies including Environmental Protection Agency, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), State of California Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, and National Marine Fisheries Service. Two were from organizations expressing support for the preferred alternative. One expressed concern about various issues related to fire such as visual and smoke impacts on air quality. Based on these letters, minor changes were made in the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS* as described on pages 420-449. No major changes were made to Alternative C, the selected course of action. Minor text changes were made in response to BAAQMD letter to ensure PRNS was in compliance with

APPENDIX C – RECORD OF COMPLIANCE

regulations and protocol. At the request of EPA, PRNS included the Biological Opinion from USFWS and NOAA Fisheries concurrence that the FMP will not likely have an adversely affect threatened fish species or adversely modify critical fish habitat.

**CONCLUSION**

Alternative C provides the most comprehensive and effective method among the alternatives considered for meeting the National Park Service’s purposes, goals, and criteria for managing fire and fire risks in Point Reyes National Seashore and the North District of GGNRA and for meeting national environmental and fire policy goals. The selection of Alternative C, as reflected by the *Final Fire Management Plan/EIS*, would not result in the impairment of park resources and would allow the National Park Service to conserve park resources and provide for their enjoyment by visitors. Alternative C would also protect the overall long-term ecological health of the park’s wilderness area.

Approved:

*signed by Jonathan B. Jarvis on October 27, 2004*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jonathan B. Jarvis, Regional Director  
Pacific West Region, National Park Service

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

