

# GOGA – TEAM DRAFT GMP

## 0: INTRO & SUMMARY PAGES

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
1.	B. Merkle	Gen.			Overall, well written and organized—and representative of park workshops.	No response necessary
2.	B. Merkle	Gen.			Short captions for photos would be useful—not everyone will be familiar with subject of photos.	
3.	LRB	general comment			There should be a parallel discussion regarding climate change, sea level rise, and impacts to cultural resources. Many archaeological properties will be lost, incomplete survey leaves the actual number unknown. Historic structures and landscape features will also be impacted by sea level rise.	
4.	LRB	general comment			The management plan fails to examine the organization of management the park uses to achieve its goals, the capacity of park management to address its goals, and alternative ways of managing for the future. It might also help to look at the often inappropriate burdens placed on individual park specialists to contend with the needs of a cacaphony of park projects, project managers, management-assisting software systems, and a general absence of park priorities, while trying to remain apprised of and manage the resources they were hired to protect.	
5.	LRB	general comment			Archaeological surveys should be conducted prior to completion of planning for actions proposed under this plan if there is a potential that previously unidentified archaeological properties may exist in the area that could contribute to a proposed action.	
6.	LRB	general comment			<p>Comment: Development of any zone has the potential to adversely impact archaeological resources because of the paucity of intensive survey conducted throughout the park. The park archaeological inventory currently contains 365 recorded sites, but only about 7-9% of parklands have been surveyed. Significant lands including Alcatraz, Forts Barry, Cronkhite, Miley, and Funston, and most San Mateo County parklands have not been adequately surveyed to identify the basic resources in need of preservation, consideration, treatment, or inclusion in visioning such as the GMP.</p> <p>The expected treatments of archaeological resources presented are so generalized and diverse that anything seems possible. How does this level of generality achieve strategic goals for the future management of these or other cultural resources?</p>	
7.	LRB	general comment			There is no presentation in this draft of the systems, inventories, or processes routinely used to identify, evaluate, and manage cultural resources. A discussion of the evolutionary development, current <u>practical</u> status of resources, and a measure of the capacity to manage those resources has not been presented. A general management plan should address these issues, as well as vision for their future. Without analyzing the current program that needs to achieve future goals, productive management needs cannot be defined. Where is the vision for the cultural resource management systems that will establish productive goals for the future?	
8.	LRB	general			The GMP draft is verbose but vacuous. The general presentation throughout the draft is	

# GOGA – TEAM DRAFT GMP

## 0: INTRO & SUMMARY PAGES

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
		comment			that many different kinds of actions might occur from a situational mixtures of ideas that are determined to be good. As time goes by they will be implemented in no particular order or duration, resulting from a cacaphony of priorities, funding sources, myriad implementing managers, and associated partners. As these good works emerge it will be up to park staff to contend with the effect of these projects on cultural resources without regard to issues of capacity. The absence of any analysis of the performance or capacity of the park’s management of cultural resources seems to present a tacit assumption that all of these actions can be adequately handled through existing systems and staff. Will things be the same as they ever were?	
9.	S. Fritzke	Gen.	n/a	n/a	Need to change the verbiage re: Alt. 1 being “the preferred alternative for park lands in Marin, SF, and San Mateo counties”, and then stating that the preferred Alt. for Muir Woods and Alcatraz is different. Muir Woods is IN Marin County, and Alcatraz is IN San Francisco County. Should change to text to something like “The preferred alt for park lands in Marin, SF, and SM counties <b>exclusive of Muir Woods and Alcatraz</b> is Alternative 1.”	
10.		Gen.	n/a	n/a	The term “Stewardship” needs to be defined somewhere in the document, and included in the glossary, and either used consistently throughout the document, or refined when used – such as for “maintenance division stewardship, stewardship of trails, stewardship of NR/CR” etc. Alt. 1 Alcatraz mentions stewardship under maintenance, but not under CR or NR. Wouldn’t stewardship occur within every division under every alternative? I can’t see that NR/CR would stop doing stewardship under Alt. 1! (The no action Alt. shows that stewardship is occurring for every discipline – this should be the same for all alts, unless there is an increase or decrease anticipated.	
11.	D. Hatch	GOLABL	All		Change ‘offshore marine ...’ to ‘nearshore marine ...’ You could add a definition that states that in this context the ‘nearshore’ is intended to include the area that extends seaward from the low water line including the littoral zone and the area influenced by nearshore or longshore currents along the inner (shallow) continental shelf.	
12.	B. Aviles	Abstr.	i	0	Does this need heading as <b>ABSTRACT</b> ?	
13.	B. Aviles	Abstr.	i	0	1 <sup>st</sup> para needs more explanation of purpose & need for new GMP/EIS. List key planning issues, etc. Do this after revising main Purpose and Need section (page 5).	
14.	B. Aviles	Abstr.	i	11	Last sentence should be first sentence of 2 <sup>nd</sup> para. Suggest adding to end of sentence: “... <b>as units of the National Park Service.</b> ” since no reference to NPS is on page.	
15.	B. Aviles	Abstr.	i	14	Sub “...no-action alternative <b>is directed</b> by existing park management <b>policies</b> ”	
16.	B. Aviles	Abstr.	i	25	Sub “ <b>showcased sites</b> ” (not each showcased site)	
17.	B. Aviles	Abstr.	ii	4	Sub “Comments <b>from the public</b> ”. Then strike public on line 5.	
18.	B. Aviles	Abstr.	ii	8	Sub “...response card, or you may submit <b>comments by letter.</b> ”	
19.	B. Aviles	Abstr.	ii	23	Is there a caveat about how we treat comments from organizations that request their comments be kept confidential?	
20.	B. Aviles	Abstr.	ii	23	Use the same structure here as we do for a comment form on PEPC. Include any leading questions like, “ <b>Describe any aspects of the non-preferred alternatives that you think should be included in the preferred alternative.</b> ”	

# GOGA – TEAM DRAFT GMP

# 0: INTRO & SUMMARY PAGES

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
21.	LRB	Summary		general comment	The summary suggests that there are, at the foundation of the GMP, two alternatives. No action and a little of Alternatives 1 (People), 2 (Ecosystems), and 3 (Treasures) mixed in vague amounts.	
22.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	6	Strike first “park”	
23.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	8	Strike “newly acquired or” It’s redundant. This occurs in other places.	
24.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	10	Strike long parens. Too much detail for summary.	
25.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	12	Add comma after “ <b>Specifically,</b> ”	
26.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	14	Add “...Stinson Beach <b>north</b> to Bolinas-Fairfax Road;”	
27.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	22	Strike “Area” after Shelldance.	
28.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	27	Strike “all lands within” Muir Woods. It’s inaccurate. We address lands outside the formal monument boundary.	
29.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	29	Suggest moving this section (Purpose) to the top.	
30.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	34	Sub “... <b>scenic open spaces</b> ” for “preservation of public open spaces”	
31.	B. Aviles	Summ.	v	38	Sub “...and varied historic <b>landscapes</b> have been identified...” Strike the rest.	
32.	B. Merkle	Summ.	v	24	Phleter Estate should be Phleger Estate—check for this mistake elsewhere in document.	
33.	B. Merkle	Summ.	v	18,20,26	Indicate area of offshore marine environment that are included—and elsewhere in document	
34.	B. Merkle	Summ.	v	38	Provide citation about being one of most biologically diverse areas	
35.	C. Powell	Summ.	v	8	Remove the (s) from acquisitions	
36.	C. Powell	Summ.	v	12	Edit line to read: Specifically, these areas include the following sites <b>within the park boundary</b> :	
37.	C. Powell	Summ.	v	34	Remove the phrase “Although always valued for their preservation of public open space” -this just doesn’t seem to fit here.	
38.	N. Hornor	Summ.	v	4		
39.	T. Williams	Summ. & Global	v	21	Revise: ...”including <i>the area south of Thornton State Beach</i> to south of Mussel Rock” Throughout the document, consider describing this section of coastline in a way that doesn’t imply that we manage Thornton Beach.	
40.	T. Williams	Summ. & Global	v	30	Change “more than 25 years” to “nearly 30 years” or “30 years.” Search document for references to this timeframe, and make consistent throughout.	
41.	D. Hatch	Summ.	v	14-18	Only include major locations in the description of the planning area and ensure that each of them is identified by name on the accompanying map.	
42.	State Parks	Summ	v	4	Change “will address” to “ <b>addresses</b> ”.	
43.	S. Fritzke	Summ.	V	7	Add “are” to the sentence “1) those that <b>are</b> not covered...”	
44.	S. Fritzke	Purpose of Plan	V	36	Universal change – statement that GGNRA and MUWO are now “ <b>considered</b> ” to be one of the most biologically diverse areas along the California Coast should be changed to “ <b>known</b> ”.	
45.	SAH	Summ	v	16	Specify Forts Barry, Cronkhite, and parts of Fort Baker parenthetically after “Marin Headlands”	
46.	SAH	Summ	vi	10	Management zones have NOT been described earlier	
47.	SAH	Summ		23-35	Distinction between ECL and HI zones is just not clear from these descriptions. HI zone	

# GOGA – TEAM DRAFT GMP

# 0: INTRO & SUMMARY PAGES

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					would include <i>nationally-significant</i> sites structures and landscapes. Say “landscapes” not “selected exteriors,” which sounds like a home decorator’s catalog not a GMP. Exploring history first hand is something they do in every zone as long as they show up for a visit. Change to “in-depth.”	
48.	B. Aviles	Summ.	vi	13	I’m not sure we need to describe the zones in the Summary. I have several edits aimed at providing parallel construction and reducing jargon. These are recorded as edits to zone descriptions on pages 59-60, and in the table beginning p. 61.	
49.	B. Merkle	Summ.	vi		Consider providing some examples of how management zones may typically be applied to help public envision	
50.	B. Merkle	Summ.	vi	23-30	Need to add natural resources into ECL zone. Areas in Marin and San Mateo Counties ECL zones, as well as Alcatraz, have important natural components of the cultural landscapes.	
51.	D. Hatch	Summ.	vi	23-30 and GLO BAL	The Evolved Cultural Landscape Zone also includes the natural resources within the zone and cultural landscapes (including numerous endangered species). The Zone description needs to describe how natural resources are considered and treated within the zone. This is actually a global comment that I have discussed with Craig Kenkel. Throughout the entire document there is no mention or discussion of natural resources and their treatment within the ECL zone and cultural landscapes themselves.	
52.	A. Roth	Summ.	vi	21	It is probably too far down the line to change this, but if at all possible, I would seriously take another look at reducing the number of zones. The number of zones create complexity that will reduce the plan's usefulness over time. Specifically, the scenic corridor and interpretive corridor seem like they could be combined. Is Interpretive Corridor ever used in the preferred alternatives?	
53.	D. Hatch	Summ.	vii	1	Mention resource stewardship as an important way to engage visitors in the Natural Zone and to protect its resources.	
54.	D. Hatch	Summ.	vii	22	How would San Mateo and other new lands be managed under the No Action alternative?	
55.	D. Hatch	Summ.	vii	30	Add to alternative description: ... San Francisco ( <i>except Alcatraz Island</i> ), and San Mateo...	
56.	D. Hatch	Summ.	vii	33-38	The description of Alt 2 is weak without including the 1 <sup>st</sup> two sentences from the Rationale (p. 52) for the concept. Resilience to climate change and expanding NR stewardship are key aspects of Alt 2.	
57.	B. Aviles	Summ.	vii	18	Nice summary that blends Concept with main thrust of the alternatives.	
58.	B. Aviles	Summ.	vii	22	Add to end: <b>“These plans have their foundation in the 1980 General Management Plan.”</b>	
59.	B. Aviles	Summ.	vii	29	Can we shorten to <b>“park’s”</b> preferred alternative for lands in...?	
60.	T. Williams		vii	11 & 13	Unless we’re planning to fence or otherwise <i>secure</i> all of these areas, delete “developed and secured” (line 11); and “secured” (line 13).	
61.	T. Williams		vii	34-38	Include intent to maximize adaptive capacity/resiliency in the face of climate change.	
62.	B. Aviles	Summ.	viii	9	Can we shorten to <b>“park’s”</b> preferred alternative...?	
63.	B. Aviles	Summ.	viii	12	Needs a short para about selection of the preferred alternative – CBA factors, review of public comments, internal reviews, consultations – then describe the preferred	

**GOGA – TEAM DRAFT GMP**

**0: INTRO & SUMMARY PAGES**

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					alternatives. Line 13 starts to do this. Better as part of an introductory para.	
64.	B. Aviles	Summ.	viii	12	This section reads poorly. It’s tedious and overlong. I think the chief qualities of the alternatives can be described here (it’s a summary), but not the process of <b>“enhancing”</b> the alternatives which overlooks the importance of maintaining the integrity of the management concept while reviewing “enhancements.” That can be described in a new opening para and left in the main body of the document, if necessary. That said, there are some important things to state or correct in this section.	
65.	B. Aviles	Summ.	viii	21	Add to end: “...Pier 4, <b>a former prison landing site in Fort Mason.</b> ”	
66.	B. Aviles	Summ.	viii	25	Sub “...stabilized ruin <b>rather than as an operational facility.</b> ”	
67.	B. Aviles	Summ.	viii	26	Seasonal access was not the agreed up treatment. See page 168. I suggest: “..., <b>incorporating bird habitat in the rehabilitation of the Parade Ground rather than strict restoration of the historic features.</b> ”	
68.	B. Aviles	Summ.	viii	28	Sub <b>“permitting”</b> for designating	
69.	B. Aviles	Summ.	viii	40	One way to incorporate the “enhancements” is saying something like: <b>“Alternative 1 shares some features of the non-preferred alternatives like,...”</b> or <b>“Key features shared with the other alternatives include...”</b>	
70.	A. Roth	Summ.	viii	38	<p>Warming Huts are first mentioned here and in other places in the document. If it is used, it should be defined so the plan can be understood by one unfamiliar with the Crissy Field warming hut. However, my overall recommendation is to discontinue use of the term Warming Hut as it invites confusion as to NPS intention in a couple of key areas: 1) type of commercial service offered. The warming hut as defined in Crissy Field is mostly retail, and a quick service food/beverage outlet with coffee bar. Little information is provided. The GMP reader might think we literally mean this mix of services, when in fact we may significant vary the mix based on the site, visitor demands, and financial feasibility. 2) the warming hut is operated by the GGNPC in the Crissy Field corridor only by an act of special legislation. For the remainder of the park, the GGNPC is not likely to be the operator for commercial visitor services. By law, they would be operated by a competitive selected concessioner.</p> <p>I recommend utilizing the term “visitor services facility” instead of warming hut, and describing this facility as a mix of information, interpretation, and commercial services which could potentially include food/beverage and retail. Visitor contact and interpretive station may also be a good descriptor for some sites.</p>	
71.	Bill Merkle	Summ.	viii	13-31	This alternative has changed considerably from previous iterations depicted in the newsletters, most notably the loss of the sensitive resource zone along the western cliffs for bird nesting. This description does not provide any detail for protections for colonial nesting birds. The western cliffs are now an Evolved Cultural Landscape Zone. The seasonal access to the Parade Ground described in the summary is conditional as discussed in more detail later in the document. I think that without more detail on these items, the statement about improving the integrity and resiliency of ecosystems for this alternative is overstated.	
72.	Bill Merkle	Summ.	viii	39	For Slide Ranch consider including plans for site improvements to address	

# GOGA – TEAM DRAFT GMP

## 0: INTRO & SUMMARY PAGES

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					environmental issues.	
73.	T. Williams	Summ.	viii	5-7	The concept of providing a “wide variety of experiences” doesn’t best represent the intent of Alt 3, and seems lost in the application of Alternative 3 to just Muir Woods and Alcatraz.	
74.	T. Williams	Summ.	viii	24-25	Revise: “...sustaining the Model Industries Building as a stabilized ruin <i>to serve as wildlife habitat</i> if an alternative....” (the ecosystem purpose isn’t clear as written).	
75.	T. Williams	Summ.	viii	37	Include concept of redesigning Stinson facility layout to provide for adaptive mgt as sea level rises.	
76.	T. Williams	Summ. & <b>Global</b>	viii	44	Is there a better term than “management roads”? Most of the roads aren’t currently used for land management, but it sounds like we’re reducing our ability to manage.	
77.	T. Williams	Summ.	viii	43-44	Replace “removal of facilities to restore lower Tennessee Valley” to “ <i>removal of facilities and restoration of stream and floodplain function in lower Tennessee Valley.</i> ”	
78.	D. Hatch	Summ.	viii	41	Change ‘rehabilitation’ to ‘restoration’	
79.	S. Fritzke	Disc. of Alts	Viii	42	Delete “a” at end of line.	
80.	SAH		viii	21	Clarify that Pier 4 was the historic pier for Island access, and that it is located at Fort Mason	
81.	HL	Summ	Viii	13	Insert “,Focusing on National Treasures,” after “Alt 3”	
82.	HL	Summ	Viii	14	Describe the CBA process somewhere, maybe in an appendix, if not already done	
83.	HL	Summ	Viii	34	Insert “,Connecting People with the Parks,” after “alt 1’	
84.	AKB		Viii	26	Seasonal access to parade ground?	
85.	BM, LR	Alcatraz Island	viii	13-31	This alternative has changed considerably from previous iterations depicted in the newsletters, most notably the loss of the sensitive resource zone along the western cliffs for bird nesting. This description does not provide any detail for protections for colonial nesting birds. The western cliffs are now an Evolved Cultural Landscape Zone. The seasonal access to the Parade Ground described in the summary is conditional as discussed in more detail later in the document.	
86.	D. Hatch	Summ.	ix	13	Describe what the ‘vision for Ocean Beach’ is	
87.	B. Aviles	Summ.	ix	12	Add “ <b>stronger</b> connection between...”	
88.	B. Aviles	Summ.	ix	14	Add “...the <b>City’s</b> Ocean Beach Vision Council...”	
89.	B. Aviles	Summ.	ix	18	Sub “...ecosystems, <b>by managing</b> portions of Ocean Beach as a Natural Zone with a <b>long</b> habitat corridor <b>connecting</b> with the Natural Zone at Fort Funston.	
90.	B. Aviles	Summ.	ix	31	Sub equestrian “ <b>uses</b> ” for facilities	
91.	B. Aviles	Summ.	ix	42-44	Strike reference to CBA if in intro para.	
92.	B. Aviles	Summ.	ix	46	Add “...forest, and <b>highlighting</b> the monument’s <b>important</b> place...”	
93.	A. Roth	Summ.	ix	15	A new Fort Funston warming hut is specifically recommended. When establishing new commercial services operations, they must meet a test of “necessary and appropriate” – see management policies for more details (I have included a relevant section in the	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

**GOGA – TEAM DRAFT GMP**

**0: INTRO & SUMMARY PAGES**

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					notes). There are over 10 coffee shops within 2 miles of Fort Funston (source: Google Maps) therefore I do not see it meeting this test. Therefore I recommend we either remove this concept or describe in slightly more detail what facility we have in mind and its purpose.	
94.	Bill Merkle	Summ.	ix	14	Overview of guidance from Ocean Beach Vision Council should be called out somewhere in document—I don't recall seeing this.	
95.	C. Powell	Summ.	ix	28	I think we need to rewrite this sentence...what are you trying to say? "...include an improved trail network that connects communities with adjacent lands." Are you trying to say connects NPS lands with surrounding communities?	
96.	HL	Summ	Ix	42	Insert “,Focusing on National Treasures,” after “alt 3”	
97.	B. Aviles	Summ.	x	10	Sub “... <b>enhancing and restoring the Redwood Creek watershed, zoning</b> [not rezoning] the <b>Muir Woods Addition</b> [not Camino del Canyon] as a Natural Zone...	
98.	B. Aviles	Summ.	x	19	Start para with <b>Distribution</b>	
99.	B. Aviles	Summ.	x	20	Sub “ <b>begins</b> ” for “there will be”	
100.	B. Aviles	Summ.	x	21	Insert “ <b>the public</b> ” ahead of other federal agencies. Strike “and individuals” on line 22.	
101.	B. Aviles	Summ.	x	27	Sub “ <b>waiting</b> ” for no-action.	
102.	B. Aviles	Summ.	x	27	Add “ <b>(ROD)</b> ” then replace reference to ROD in quotations elsewhere.	
103.	B. Aviles	Summ.	x	28	Reference the <b>Pacific West</b> Regional Director signs the ROD, <b>at the recommendation of the park superintendent.</b> (That's true?)	
104.	B. Aviles	Summ.	x	31	Sub “...Once the <b>ROD is signed</b> , the selected alternative <b>will</b> become...”	
105.	T. Williams	Summ.	x	10	Change “rezoning” to “including”	
106.	B. Aviles	Figures	xviii	1	Title of maps should identify the <b>PREFERRED</b> alternatives	
107.						
108.						
109.						
110.						
111.						
112.						
113.						
114.						
115.						
116.						
117.						
118.						
119.						
120.						
121.						