

DRAFT – FOR INTERNAL REVIEW ONLY

Boundary Adjustments and the GMP

Chapter 1

Law and Policy

NPS *Management Policies 2006* (Section 2.3.1.1) and NPS Park Planning Program Standards require general management plans to address changes to a park's boundary. The boundary of a national park unit may be modified only as authorized by law. For many parks, such statutory authority is included in the enabling legislation or subsequent legislation that specifically authorizes a boundary revision. Where park-specific authority is not available, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, provides an additional but limited authority to adjust boundaries.

The LWCF Act provides for boundary adjustments that essentially fall into three distinct categories: (1) technical revisions; (2) minor revisions based upon statutorily defined criteria; and (3) revisions to include adjacent real property acquired by donation, purchased with donated funds, transferred from any other federal agency, or obtained by exchange. Adjacent real property is considered to be land located contiguous to but outside the boundary of a national park system unit.

NPS *Management Policies 2006* (Section 3.5) state that

“the Park Service will identify and evaluate boundary adjustments that may be necessary or desirable for carrying out the purposes of the park unit. Boundary adjustments may be recommended to

- protect significant resources and values, or to enhance opportunities for public enjoyment related to park purposes;
- address operational and management issues, such as the need for access or the need for boundaries to correspond to logical boundary delineations such as topographic or other natural features or roads; or
- otherwise protect park resources that are critical to fulfilling park purposes.”

If the acquisition will be made using appropriated funds, and it is not merely a technical boundary revision, the criteria set forth by Congress at 16 USC 460l-9(c)(2) must be met. All recommendations for boundary changes must meet the following two criteria:

- The added lands will be feasible to administer considering their size, configuration, and ownership; costs; the views of and impacts on local communities and surrounding jurisdictions; and other factors such as the presence of hazardous substances or exotic species.

- Other alternatives for management and resource protection are not adequate.

These criteria apply conversely to recommendations for the deletion of lands from the authorized boundaries of a park unit. For example, before recommending the deletion of land from a park boundary, a finding would have to be made that the land did not include a significant resource, value, or opportunity for public enjoyment related to the purposes of the park. Full consideration should be given to current and future park needs before a recommendation is made to delete lands from the authorized boundaries of a park unit. Actions consisting solely of deletions of land from existing park boundaries would require an act of Congress.

Federal fee-simple ownership (all of the rights associated with real property) provides the National Park Service with the greatest ability to protect and manage resources and provide for public use and enjoyment. Less-than-fee interests (some of the rights associated with real property) require a federal commitment to monitor and enforce the Service's interest in the affected property. Acquisition of less-than-fee interests may be appropriate in instances in which the Service needs only a specific interest in land, or in which it needs to modify uses of the land to protect resources or values but full fee ownership is not required or possible.

Acquisition of fee-simple interests is a critically important and effective land protection method for lands within park unit boundaries. The Service may employ, as appropriate, a broad strategy to protect land and resources, including innovative techniques; partnerships; participation in the planning and decision-making processes of other federal agencies; and vigilance at the regional and local levels of government where nonfederal land use decisions are generally made.

Authorizing Legislation for GOGA

The park's enabling legislation (PL 92-589) states that "the Secretary may make minor revisions of the boundaries of the recreation area when necessary by publication of a revised drawing or other boundary description in the Federal Register." This law also states that "within the boundaries of the recreation area, the Secretary may acquire lands, improvements, waters, or interests therein, by donation, purchase, exchange, or transfer. Any lands, or interests therein, owned by the State of California or any political subdivision thereof, may be acquired only by donation. When any tract of land is only partly within such boundaries, the Secretary may acquire all or any portion of the land outside of such boundaries in order to minimize the payment of severance costs."

The authorized boundary of the recreation area has been adjusted many times since the passage of PL 92-589 in 1972. Most of the boundary adjustments have been codified through law. However, acquiring a property that is adjacent to, and contiguous with, the boundary of the recreation area could be considered a minor boundary adjustment, which would only require approval from the Secretary of the Interior and then publishing a notice in the Federal Register.

Chapter 2

General Guidance (common to all alternatives)

GGNRA will develop a land protection plan based on the GMP preferred alternative that will enable the park to

- play a partnership role in regional land protection efforts
- coordinate land acquisition opportunities with other public land managers adjacent to GGNRA when goals and objectives are shared
- critically evaluate potential acquisition lands to ensure that the park is not accepting liabilities or undue management burdens that are unrelated to park goals
- explore funding opportunities to support the rehabilitation and long-term stewardship of all newly acquired properties.

Boundary Adjustment Notes by Alternative

Alt 1 – Connecting People with the Parks

Vision:

A diversity of park settings and opportunities would encourage, attract and welcome diverse current and future populations while maintaining the integrity of the park's ecosystems.

Goals:

- Connectivity between communities (~~including underserved communities~~) and park sites is assured and enhanced through acquisition or protection strategies for lands, trails, trailheads, and hubs that support park access
- ~~Public lands adjacent to GGNRA managed lands are protected to provide enhanced recreation or protection of existing park settings that enhance visitor experience~~
- Rural, wild landscapes and marine areas are preserved to enhance the scenic and recreational setting and increase visitor opportunities in the park or in local communities

Notes & Ideas to Evolve the Goals:

- Relevancy to people
- See Haller's list of important cultural resources for San Mateo County
- Point Montara Lighthouse
- State Lands leases (matching to park boundary, contiguity)
- Preserving rural landscape/heritage (i.e., Tomales Bay)
- Urban infill – brownfields to parks
- Regional trail gaps
- Improve access to parks [trails, trailheads, remote parking (i.e., Marin City, Manzanita PNR, San Bruno trailhead)]
- Connections to communities with visitor serving facilities (Sharp Park, Lincoln Park)
- Connecting important resources, missing pieces (Corral de Tierra)

Alt 2 – Preserving and Enjoying Coastal Ecosystems

Vision:

Coastal ecosystems are enhanced by filling habitat gaps, creating habitat linkages, and providing for recovery of special status species and survival of wide ranging wildlife. Land protection would be guided by a science-based approach that builds on the goals of cooperative regional efforts.

Goals:

- Reconnect fragmented habitat within and adjacent to both parks to restore landscape-level processes and increase ecosystem resiliency to climate change and urban pressures.
- Optimize recovery of special status species and survival of wide-ranging wildlife.
- Restore natural processes and/or allow these processes to evolve unimpeded to the greatest degree feasible.
- ~~Emphasize sites and stories about coastal resources, including shipwrecks, archeological sites, agricultural lands and uses, coastal defense, and lighthouses.~~
- Identify opportunities to integrate the science and goals of the following programs into the acquisition strategy: Upland Goals, SF Baylands and Subtidal Goals, Marine Protected Areas.
- Expand management of nearshore marine environment to protect critical marine resources and coastal islands and to address natural resource preservation needs that are not included in existing management agreements (BLM Monument; State Lands lease)
- ~~Expand management focus to the watershed level to restore landscape level processes~~

Notes & Ideas to Evolve the Goals:

- Attention to southern lands
- Marine boundary; Marine Protected Areas; Bolinas Lagoon
- State Lands leases (matching to park boundary, contiguity); BLM Monument islands (Daphne, need proper name)
- Cooperative acquisition and management
- Watershed protection (Redwood Creek, Tomales Bay)
- Connecting fragmented habitats (i.e. SF garter snake); connecting islands of land (Milagra Ridge)
- Consider Pillar Point area;
- Point Montara Lighthouse
- Consider the land requirements to support the park as a “center of science”, learning

Alt. 3 – Focusing on National Treasures

Vision:

Sites that contain national treasures or are essential to their preservation are protected.

Goals:

- 1) Land acquisition is focused on maintaining park significance and supporting the park's fundamental resources and values.
- 2) Identify and acquire fundamental resources outside of park boundaries that would serve as showcased "national treasures" (e.g., Angel Island, lighthouses, viewsheds, offshore marine areas and islands)
- 3) Identify resources outside of park boundaries that contribute to the showcased sites and protect them through cooperative management arrangements or technical assistance.
- 4) Identify alternative management arrangements (including land exchange) for park lands that do not fully contribute to promoting the national treasures.

Notes & Ideas to Evolve the Goals:

- Controlled access point for Alcatraz
- See Haller's list of important cultural resources for San Mateo County; Do we have all of the nationally significant resources? (acquisition or cooperative mgmt)
- Requirements for museum collections facility
- Park entrance - Ft. Mason – gas house cove marina
- Viewsheds; Watersheds (Tomales Bay, Bolinas Lagoon)
- Point Montara Lighthouse
- State Lands leases (matching to park boundary, contiguity)
- Muir Woods Park neighborhood
- Tourist Club
- Van Ness pump station as entrance
- Fort Point maintenance areas
- GG bridge
- Doyle Drive

Alt. 4 – Collaborating Regionally

Vision:

A seamless corridor of protected lands would be connected by local and regional parks, open spaces, and communities.

Goals:

- Visitor Experience
 - Use “gap analysis” to identify seamless public corridor and those key properties that would help fill breaks in this connection.
 - Develop land protection strategy that would make sense logistically and can range from acquisition to cooperative management to management by others-- any management entity would appear seamless to the public.
 - Identify major transportation hubs, trails, portals, etc. that would connect communities and parks both inside and outside NPS lands.
- Natural Resources
 - Partner with current regional planning efforts that are identifying key habitats and locations for protection (e.g., Upland Goals Project, Baylands and Subtidal Goals Project)*
 - Locally, use “gap” analysis to identify key natural resources within Park lands (e.g., SF garter snake and salmonids) that require habitat connectivity both inside and outside NPS lands
 - Develop land protection strategy that would make sense logistically and can range from acquisition to cooperative management to management by others-- any management entity would appear seamless in terms of resource protection (e.g., joint BMPs for roads and trails).

* think about whether regional planning effort link should be science-based or political (e.g., Upland Goals vs. Green Vision)

Notes & Ideas to Evolve the Goals:

- Change in wording from public to protected in vision statement is deliberate → there may be private lands with conservation easements that would meet seamless connection concept
- Transportation hubs; joint facilities (cooperative mgmt)
- Connecting trails and transit; remote parking
- Entrance portals to park (East near the pump house on Van Ness)
- Connections to inner city
- Wildlife connections through cities (over/underpasses)
- State Lands leases (matching to park boundary, contiguity);
- Contiguous habitat
- Watersheds and viewsheds
- Cultural landscapes (i.e., Sanchez adobe)