

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
1.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	49	3	Good narrative that helps bridge to alternatives. My concern is that it's very conversational. Something we often want, but too much can be problematic, as in this case where we have a rather confusing process that needs to be explained very simply. I would emphasize that public input (not scoping comments) helped us REFINE, not define, the issues (lines 12-13).	retain  Change made
2.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	49	27	There are at least 3 parts to the management alternatives: concept, zone maps, and narratives. I think we may be spending too much time on the development of the CONCEPTS as something independent of the alternatives. Maybe we should put our description of the process in the "Consultation and Coordination" section? Add a diagram: concepts/preliminary alts/CBA/preferred alts...?	Retain, recommend having in one place and upfront the process of how alt were developed, even if we discussed outreach for that was part of the process.
3.	N. Hornor	Build Alts	49	1,7,19	Insert month/year of each referenced newsletter	done
4.	N. Hornor		49	25	Delete "over time"	done
5.	N. Hornor		49	29	Delete "widest"	done
6.	N. Hornor		49	31	Change "services" to "visitor use and services"	done
7.	N. Hornor		49	32	Add paragraph break here	done
8.	N. Hornor		49	33	Delete "overall"	done
9.	N. Hornor		49	36	Change to "reflected"	done
10.	N. Hornor		49	42	Change "idea" to "concept"	done
11.	T. Williams		49	22 & 24	With the reality of climate change effects, it seems like combining Concepts 2 and 4 would create a powerful and relevant concept.	Retain, alts are already done
12.	T. Williams		49	28	Insert: "Second, <i>management zones are applied to the park to reflect the concept of the alternative.</i> Management zones are created...."	You can't apply the zones before you create them. Different change made
13.	D. Hatch	Intro	49	3	What dates or years were the newsletters and open houses?	done
14.	State Parks		49	20	Add colon after "included"	Retained. Not correct.
15.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	50	16	Add sentence at end: " <b>The other draft alternatives are referred to as "action" alternatives.</b> "	Done
16.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	50	19	Too many next steps... End like this: "...were selected. <b>Finally, this section presents a general explanation of the management zones. The zones are described in detail in Appendix Z.</b> "	Done
17.	N. Hornor		50	4	Insert month/year of referenced newsletter	Done
18.	N. Hornor		50	5	Change "input" to "comments"	done
19.	N. Hornor		50	8	Add paragraph break	
20.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	51	1	I suggest we cut to the chase – present the draft alternatives. The concepts make sense as part of the alternatives. Move this section.	Retain, same reasons as noted above
21.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	51	5-11	The description of "Collaborating Regionally" was already explained. Cut. End: "...The following concepts form the basis for the <b>management</b> alternatives. (Or move section beneath the alternatives...)"	done
22.	B. Aviles	Build.	51	13	(Could be labeled as Alternative 1... Same for other Concepts pp 52-53.)	Done

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
23.	N. Hornor		51	3-11	Delete – repeats from p 49 – could keep the last sentence	done
24.	N. Hornor		51	15	Delete “potential”	Done
25.	N. Hornor		51	34	parks	Done
26.	S. Fritzsche	Cncpt 1	51	22-23	The founding idea of “parks to the people” relates to GOGA, but not MUWO or FOPO. Need to clarify this.	We did in the park purpose statement in the intro background section
27.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	52	3	Strike text in parens.	done
28.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	52	18	Can we just say “conserve and enhance” Drop “ <i>promote</i> ”?	Retain, promote is our regional coordination and outreach part
29.	T. Williams		52	18-22	Newsletter 4 and previous text provided a clearer and more compelling description of Concept 2.	retain
30.	LRB	Concept 1	52	2-3	“...rehabilitation of cultural resources (structures, landscapes, and archaeological sites)...”	Done
31.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	53	14	Strike text in parens.	done
32.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	53	33	Can we say “ <b>showcased sites</b> ” not “each showcased site”? No big diff?	retain
33.	N. Hornor		53	2	Change “critical” to “sensitive”	done
34.	N. Hornor		53	33	Showcased – can we find a better word? priority site?	Retain unless someone comes up with one. But this has worked for us up to this point.
35.	D. Hatch	Alt Cncpt 2	53	8-9	I don’t understand this bullet.	Revised slightly
36.	D. Hatch	Alt Cncpt 3	54	21, 30, 33	Change ‘each park’s’ to each park site or name Alcatraz, Muir Woods and the rest of Golden Gate.	Revised and tied it to each park significance statement.
37.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	54	20	Sub “...contribute to the <b>national</b> significance of the park.” Drop language about NHLs.	Done, but Retain - need to keep NHL in.
38.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	54	30 & 33	Vestige of when we used to <i>ruthlessly</i> say there were <b>2</b> parks: GOGA and MUWO. Replace “each” with “ <b>the</b> ”.	Revised as noted above
39.	N. Hornor		54	20& 32	Delete “each” before “park’s”	Revised as noted above
40.	T. Williams		54	32	Include processes: “...fundamental natural resources <i>and processes</i> that support...”	done
41.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	55	1	Is the description of “enhancements” too much disclosure and discussion of process? Does it help the reader? Will anyone read this?	Yes, especially our reviewers
42.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	55	26-31	Drop scoring language. “...Alternative 1 <b>represents the greatest</b> advantage for the park...” Same for Alt. 3 below. Combine ALCA and MUWO.	done
43.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	55	32	This paragraph begins the most confusing part of the document. Can we simplify to say that the CBA was an important <b>stage</b> in selected and refining the preferred alternative? Critical	Done

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					changes were made to incorporate ideas from the other alternatives where they were <b>consistent with the management concept</b> and provided additional “advantages” to the park. We continued to shape the preferred alternative well after the CBA through additional public comment and somewhat dramatically in consultation with PWRO.	
44.	B. Merkle	Build. Alts.	55	17-20	Including 3 evaluation topics related to visitors could have potentially biased the CBA towards selection of Connecting People Alternative. It seems like these 3 topics could have been condensed to one. NR and CR each had only one evaluation topic.	Retain, process complete
45.	N. Hornor		55	6	Delete “and disadvantages”	done
46.	N. Hornor		55	16	NHL “Districts”?	done
47.	T. Williams		55	23-25	It would be helpful to state that Muir Woods, Alcatraz, and the remainder of each of the three counties were evaluated separately in selecting the preferred alternatives.	Retain,
48.	T. Williams		55	28	Insert: “excluding Alcatraz, <i>and Muir Woods National Monument.</i> ”	revised
49.	State Parks		55	23	Change “evaluations” to “evaluation”	done
50.	State Parks		55	30	Change “For” to “for”	done
51.	S. Fritzke	Intro Alt 1	55	28	Alt 1 scored highest excluding Alcatraz <b>and Muir Woods</b> (need to add MUWO)	done
52.	S. Fritzke	Select Alt 1	56	7	Universal Comment – The term “warming hut” is scattered throughout the document. This term needs to be defined and explained – what is included, what is not? Will it include NPS staff? A Visitor contact opportunity? Or just food service and gift shop? Since the warming hut constitutes the site at Crissy Field, I would suggest using a different term for a more universal concept for other park sites.	This section was deleted
53.	S. Fritzke	Select Alt 1	56	8	Creek restoration at Capehart? Huh?	This section was deleted
54.	S. Fritzke	Select Alt 1	56	26	When the “vision” for Ocean Beach from the Ocean Beach Vision Council is cited, it should be defined or articulated in an appendix. Many people do not know what the vision is, or whether the NPS was part of that process.	This section was deleted
55.	S. Fritzke	Select Alt 1	56	42	Re: Shelldance Nursery. I would suggest modifying this to read “the former site of the Shelldance Nursery” or “the site of the former Shelldance Nursery” or something – to make it is clear this is no longer an active commercial orchid nursery.	This section was deleted
56.	State Parks		56	8	Add “and” before “keeping”	This section was deleted
57.	State Parks		56	12	Delete “a” after “as”	This section was deleted
58.	B. Aviles	Build. Alts.	56	1	Sequence of sites is different than in earlier section (page viii) where Alcatraz was first. See pages viii, ix, and x for edits. I suggest we use exact same language.	This section was deleted
59.	N. Hornor		56	4	If we need to keep: Change “wildlands” to “national park lands” change “highlights” to “features”	This section was deleted
60.	N. Hornor		56	8	If we need to keep: Delete “creek rest. at Capehart”	This section was deleted
61.	N. Hornor		56	17	<b>Marin</b> Headdlands	This section was deleted
62.	N. Hornor		56	23	Delete “to the national park = next door”	This section was deleted
63.	N. Hornor		56	25	Change to “improved Bay Trail connection between Aquatic Park and Fort Mason	This section was deleted
64.	N. Hornor		56	27 –	delete Ocean Beach Vision reference.	This section was deleted

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
65.	N. Hornor		56	42	If keeping...add “retains the Montara Lighthouse hostel, and include improved visitor orientation facilities in Pacifica and s. of Dev. Slide.”	This section was deleted
66.	N. Hornor		56	38	Change to “protected public”	Done
67.	N. Hornor		56-58		Can these pages be deleted – seems like more repetition. If needed, I suggest that they be condensed, give more general examples.	Yes, delete since the reader has the alternatives to review plus the Environmentally preferred alternative where this text can be added.
68.	T. Williams		56-58		The locations referenced in this section should be shown on a map.	This section was deleted
69.	D. Hatch	Select Alt 1	56	8, 26-27	Site names may be too detailed. Someone needs to see any place named in the document on a map or it needs a good description of its location. What are the key concepts of the Ocean Beach vision?	This section was deleted
70.	D. Hatch	Select Alt 3	57	16-17	The alternative makes Bldg 64, the Laundry Bldg and the Parade Ground <b>more</b> accessible to visitors. They are all already accessible to visitors.	done
71.	LR	Select ion of Alt. 3 for AZ	57	13	If the preferred alternative was selected largely due to its emphasis “on immersing visitors in all periods of Alcatraz’ history”, I would like to see the periods before the military and after the Indian Occupation, when seabird nesting colonies were active, reflected as well. Evidence for breeding seabirds pre-military include descriptions of the island encrusted in guano, the naming of the island for seabirds, and photos showing black birds covering the sides of the island. Since the NPS began managing Alcatraz, seabirds took advantage of the protection provided by the NPS and re-colonized the island. The nesting birds have increased over the past 20 years and GGNRA has managed for their protection. Without including detail on protection for the nesting birds, it is not clear if this protection will continue. It is also unknown where these birds will go without protection because the Bay area is extremely developed and without this protected areas provided by NPS, they may have no alternative habitat for nesting.	This section was deleted
72.	B. Merkle, LR	Build. Alts.	57	19-28	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. This would mean that protection of nesting birds will depend largely on the CLR under development. The significance of the birds are undervalued in the CLR as it focuses on the historic period of significance Civil War through American Indian Movement, while the birds were important pre-European development and post conversion to park. The period of park management has demonstrated strong commitments to protecting the colonial nesting birds making use of the island. 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.	This section was deleted
73.	B. Merkle	Build.	57	34-35	Suggest protecting the redwood forest ecosystem as opposed to protecting nature.	This section was deleted

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
		Alts.				
74.	N. Hornor		57	6	Change “developing” to “promoting”	This section was deleted
75.	N. Hornor		57	16	“increased visitor access to” instead of “made accessible”	This section was deleted
76.	N. Hornor		57	17	Delete “to visitors”	This section was deleted
77.	N. Hornor	Select Pref Alt	57	22	Delete” if an alternative maintenance facility etc. This is not what is in the preferred alt.	This section was deleted
78.	N. Hornor		57	23	Change “only seasonal” to “year round” (see line 21-22 p. 168)	This section was deleted
79.	N. Hornor		57	25	Insert “Providing overnight accommodations for stewardship and conservation program participants” after “including”	This section was deleted
80.	N. Hornor		57	35	Change “nature” to “ecosystems”	This section was deleted
81.	N. Hornor		58	3	Add: “from that area” at end of sent to clarify it pertains to CdC	This section was deleted
82.	B. Aviles	Mgmt Zones	59	5	Strike “...and opportunities” – redundant. Strike “and visitor services” – uneven detail. Stick to core GMP decisions.	Done
83.	B. Aviles	Mgmt Zones	59	7-9	Strike process sentence.	done
84.	B. Aviles	Mgmt Zones	59	11	Simplify: “...and development <b>appropriate to</b> the park.”	done
85.	B. Aviles	Mgmt Zones	59	12	Point the reader to Appendix Z for detailed description of the zones.	done
86.	B. Aviles	Mgmt Zones	59	16+	<p>Suggested rewrite of zone summaries follows. I tried to have more parallel construction and highlight the key differences among zones:</p> <p><b>Diverse Opportunities Zone</b>  <b>These areas</b> <del>This area</del> would provide a range of natural, historic, or <b>contemporary</b> <del>developed</del> settings <b>to welcome and support the widest variety of visitor opportunities appropriate in the park.</b> <del>and would be able to accommodate a large variety of visitor uses opportunities.</del></p> <p><b>Significant</b> Fundamental park resources would be preserved while different levels of visitor use would be accommodated. People would have a wide range of educational, interpretive, and <del>outdoor</del> recreational opportunities to enjoy and appreciate the park’s resources.</p> <p><b>Scenic Corridor Zone</b>  <b>These areas</b> <del>This area</del> would be a scenic <b>trails, roads, and</b> <del>or coastlines</del> <del>marine corridor</del> that provides for sightseeing and related recreational opportunities. Resources could be modified in this zone to highlight and enhance the natural, cultural, and scenic values, as well as to provide for a safe tour route.</p> <p><b>Evolved Cultural Landscape Zone</b>  <b>These areas</b> <del>This area</del> would preserve <del>reflect its</del> significant historic, archeological, <del>agricultural</del>, architectural, and <del>related</del> landscape features while being adaptively reused for contemporary park and partner <b>needs</b> uses. <del>Contributing Cultural resources exterior or</del></p>	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					<p><del>interior historic elements, as well as the surrounding natural resources that are often integral to the historic site, would be preserved and interpreted. while the sites, structures, and buildings that compose the landscape would be available for adaptive reuse. The area historic scene could contribute to visitor enjoyment and interpretation and exploration of the historic values and events yet provide for other types of uses visitor opportunities. Working landscapes could be compatible with an aspect of this zone.</del></p> <p><b>Historic Immersion Zone</b>                      These areas would <del>include</del> <b>preserve complex historic</b> sites, structures, and <del>cultural</del> landscapes that are evocative of their period of significance. Selected exteriors and designated portions of interior spaces would be managed to protect their historic values and attributes. Visitors would have opportunities to explore history with first hand, <b>by direct contact with experiencing</b> cultural resources, <b>complemented by rich interpretation of and exploring</b> past stories and events.</p> <p><b>Interpretive Corridor Zone</b>  <del>This area</del> <b>These areas</b> would <b>preserve the park’s iconic</b> <del>retain its</del> natural characteristics and would be <del>preserved and</del> <b>richly</b> interpreted through a variety of means. This area would <b>accommodate</b> <del>have</del> a moderate to high number of visitors along well-defined and highly managed trails. Visitor use would be managed to preserve important resources and their associated values and could <b>involve include</b> controlled <del>and managed</del> access.</p> <p><b>Natural Zone</b>                      These <b>large interconnected</b> areas would retain their natural, wild, <b>and dynamic</b> characteristics <b>and ecological functions</b>. They would be managed to preserve natural resources and maintain resource integrity while accommodating low to moderate levels of visitor use. Visitors would have opportunities to directly experience and understand the natural resources <b>principally on trails in these areas</b>. Visitor use would be managed to preserve <b>all</b> important resources and their associated values and could <b>involve include</b> controlled <del>and managed</del> access. External threats to resources would be aggressively addressed.</p> <p><b>Sensitive Resources Zone</b>                      These areas would consist of fundamental natural resources that are <del>very</del> <b>highly</b> sensitive to a variety of <b>activities impacts</b>, and would receive the highest level of protection. <del>The natural</del> Resources would be managed to preserve their fundamental values while being monitored and <b>often possibly</b> studied for scientific <b>purposes investigation</b>. Access to these areas would be highly controlled. These areas could be subject to <del>possible</del> closures and <b>access could be restricted to the less sensitive edges of the zone.</b> <del>access</del>. External threats to resources would be aggressively addressed.</p> <p><b>Park Operations Zone</b></p>	

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					These areas would primarily support developed <del>and secured</del> facilities for operations and maintenance functions of the park and its partners. This zone would be managed to provide <del>operation</del> facilities that are safe, secured, and appropriate for <b>functions</b> uses required for park management. Access to these areas for visitors would be controlled and limited to <del>purposes of orientation</del> , organized meetings, <b>programs</b> , and access to park administration.	
87.	B. Merkle, LR	Mgmt Zones	59	29-31	Need to include how this zone incorporates natural resources and features. Concern about how bird nesting areas fit into ECL zone on Alcatraz and importance of natural features of landscape in Marin and San Mateo Counties.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
88.	N. Hornor	Mgmt zones	59	10	Delete “widest”	done
89.	N. Hornor		59	12	Table	No, we don’t capitalize table, unless we use the entire title of the table
90.	N. Hornor		gen	Gen	Do not start every paragraph with “this area would”, for example I suggest line 16 – delete “This area would” and start sent with “Provides a range of ...” Include number of visitors for each zone (now only in some)	Revised 1. This management zone... 2. Removed visitor use numbers since they are embedded in the details descriptions
91.	N. Hornor		59	16	Insert “and facilities” delete “and would be”after settings,	done
92.	N. Hornor		59	24	Insert “and facilities provided” after “zone”	done
93.	T. Williams		59	35	Define “working landscapes”	removed
94.	D. Hatch	Mgmt Zones	59, 73	29-35	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.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
95.	N. Hornor		60	22	Add “facilities would be on the periphery of the zone to extent possible”	Done
96.	T. Williams		60	8	Is the Interpretive Corridor Zone applied in any of the alternatives?	Just MUWO
97.	SH		60	1	Historic Immersion Zone description is too weak and is written in such a way that is it not clearly distinguished from the Evolved Cultural Landscape. Drop any reference in this whole document to “selected exteriors:” there is no such kind of resource recognized in NPS-28 and it sounds like an interior decorator talking. Replace this zone description, here and elsewhere, with:  <i>These areas would include sites, structures and cultural landscapes that are especially evocative of their period of significance. Landscapes and designated building interiors would be managed to protect and enhance their historic values. Visitors would have stronger opportunities to explore history in-depth by experiencing cultural resources and exploring</i>	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					<i>past stories and events. There would be a higher potential for selective restoration efforts in this zone.</i>	
98.	SH		60	8	So what’s the deal with this zone, and why is interpretive corridor only about natural resource interpretation? I think this was once specific to Muir Woods, but I don’t see it anywhere on any of the Zone maps for MUWO or GOGA. Is it obsolete and should it be dropped?	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
99.	B. Aviles	Mgmt Zones	61	1	<b>Relieve the reader</b> by putting this table in another spot. Too much detail before getting to the alternatives. Appendix? Handout? Think about how this relates to the “Mitigative Measures” and “NPS Policies” in the appendix. I think anything in those sections that is specific to the park should be moved into the zones section.	Done retain
100.	B. Aviles	Mgmt Zones			GLOBAL: minimizes use of slashes “/”	Edited as necessary.
101.	B. Merkle	Table 1	61		Should treat how resources are treated consistently. For example, new language on CR has regulatory language included, if keep then would need for other resources (e.g. Section 7 consultations may be necessary within T&E habitats, etc.)	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
102.	B. Aviles	Div. Opps	61-105	?	Lack of numbering on lines made this had to record comments. In general, there is a good bit of <i>wordsmithing</i> to be done. Some phrases are awkward (“inordinate impacts”?) and inconsistent from section to section. Too many spelling and grammar issues: National Register. Drop “Coastal Ecosystems” subheading. It provides little information since whole park is coastal. Combine “Submerged cultural resources” under archeological resource heading since I could not find a single difference between these sections. Interpretive themes are communicated (?) rather than presented (?) using different methods (not opportunities). Museum Collection section says nothing about how those resources would be managed in the zones, which was an oversight in Diverse Opps and Operational Facilities?	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
103.	N. Hornor		61-105		Move to appendix, poster that’s removable, table format so that it’s easier to see the difference and similarities between the zones	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
104.	T. Williams		61-105		For all zones, suggest that Natural Resources descriptions include a statement regarding level of protection from/exposure to noise and artificial light.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
105.	D. Hatch	Table 1 Mgmt Zone Detail	61-105		The detailed descriptions of the management zones needs to be in a side-by-side fold out table in order to compare them and better understand the differences between them.  Some changes to NR descriptions were made from the original table (needed to be shortened) but now seem a bit watered down and possibly too much alike across the zones. I think it would be easier for NR staff to review and strengthen these when they are back in table format.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					<p>Wherever T&amp;E species are mentioned delete reference to ‘designated critical habitat’ as this is a legal definition that does not encompass all of our T&amp;E habitat for which we still have responsibility to preserve and restore. Suggested changing to ‘T&amp;E species and their habitat’</p> <p>The Cultural Resource zone descriptions have gotten more regulatory which is not consistent with the other topics in the table. These references should be removed and the descriptions focused on desired conditions and how resources would be managed.</p> <p>Each of the ‘Cultural Landscapes’ descriptions need to incorporate the important natural resources within them. Suggest consulting with Craig K on this.</p> <p>Interpretive Corridor Zone – add in parentheses (in Muir Woods NM only)</p> <p>Natural Sounds and Dark Night Skies throughout most (or all?) zones- add that the park would actively manage soundscapes and lightscapes to restore more natural conditions to the greatest extent possible/feasible. Looks like this is in there for Dark Skies but not for Soundscapes???</p>	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
106.	T. Williams		62		Coastal Ecosystems: Vegetation – end of section – delete “in the park”.	Done.
107.	S. Fritzke	Div Opps Zone	62	NR sect	These seem to be almost identical from Zone to Zone – esp. vegetation resources., T&E resources Seems like at least some of these zones should take an aggressive stance toward NR issues.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
108.	LRB	Details of Management Zones (Table 1)	63, 69, 75, 81, 86, 91, 97, 102	Ethnographic Resources Sections	New: <b>Other cultural and ethnic groups connected with park lands and historic properties would be treated with equal respect in efforts to properly consider the treatment of associated properties or their use or interpretation.</b>	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
109.	LRB	Details of Management Zones (Table 1)	63, 69, 75, 81, 86, 92, 98, 103	Archaeological Resources Sections	Spelling: “...in <del>sutu</del> -situ...”	Done
110.	SH		63		Archeology - Change second sentence to “Preserved archeological resources would be kept in a stable condition...”	Done

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
111.	AsF	Diverse Ops Zone	64		The section on Museum Collections is the same for each mgmt zone. Add one sentence to the main narrative for each that describes desired conditions. Change to “Museum Collections (archeological artifacts, archival materials, and historical artifacts) will be documented, cataloged and protected to ensure long-term preservation according to NPS standards and guidelines. Collections will be made available for research, exhibit and educational programming to engage the public in ongoing stewardship.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
112.	T. Williams		65, 77, 83,		Dark Night Skies (Lightscapes) – Revise: “Outdoor lighting would provide <i>appropriate</i> illumination for <i>safety</i> , ( <i>and specific cultural resource requirements*</i> ;) while minimizing light pollution.” * optional phrase depending on particular zone.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
113.	B. Aviles		66	1	DO Zone Development: I think this section should address NEW development rather than the character of the zone (wild, historic, etc.). <b>“New development would be minor and focused on improving or replacing the diverse existing facilities that support visitor use. This should not encroach upon the natural setting.”</b> Access: <b>“Convenient access would be important in this zone. Connections to community trails, bicycle lanes, transit stops, and roads would be developed.”</b> Types of facilities: drop odd collection of “designated”, boat docks, etc. List of transportation facilities should read: <b>“trails, paths, roads, and other transportation facilities.”</b> Programming: The lists need consistency from zone to zone. It’s unclear why arts, science and other terms are used in one zone and not another. Good places to say COMMUNITY STEWARDSHIP and CITIZEN SCIENCE... (INTERP!).	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
114.	A. Roth		66	Div. Ops	For Commercial Services and nonprofit programming, I would like to rewrite my own text as follows  “A variety of necessary and appropriate commercial services offerings that may be available include but are not limited to: equipment rentals, guides, food and beverage, recreational, equestrian, overnight accommodations, retail, etc. A variety of nonprofit programming that may be available include but are not limited to environmental, educational, interpretive, community, arts, etc. Certain buildings may be leased for compatible uses.”  Also, overlap from the visitor services section should be addressed in each one of these sections.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
115.	B. Aviles		70	1	Visitor Experience: How about, “Visitors would <b>be invited</b> to take scenic tours along the corridor with multiple opportunities to stop along the route to <b>enjoy the scenery, view wildlife, picnic, or read</b> interpretive or educational information.”	Retain.
116.	AsF	Scenic Corridor Zone	70		Museum Collections. Change to “Museum Collections (archeological artifacts, archival materials, and historical artifacts) will be documented, cataloged and protected to ensure long-term preservation according to NPS standards and guidelines. Natural History collections will promote research, exhibit, and educational opportunities.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
117.	B. Aviles	Scen. Corr.	71		Scenic Corridor Zone – Levels of Development: “... <b>could</b> include...direct visitor use.” (Strike bit about mixed open space. This is “character”.	Revised.
118.	B. Aviles	Mgmt Zones	All		In all ZONES: I suggest we strike “ <b>canoeing</b> ”. We say boating and kayaking, which is broad enough. Not many good locations for canoeing in the planning area.	Done
119.	B. Aviles		72	1	Facilities/support: “ <b>Campgrounds and rustic overnight accommodations</b> , limited retail,...	Done
120.	A. Roth		72	Scen. Corr	For Commercial Services and nonprofit programming, I would like to rewrite my own text as follows:  “A variety of necessary and appropriate commercial services offerings that may be available include but are not limited to: equipment rentals, guides, food and beverage, recreational, equestrian, overnight accommodations, retail, etc. A variety of nonprofit programming that may be available include but are not limited to environmental, educational, interpretive, community, arts, etc. Certain buildings may be leased for compatible uses.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
121.	B. Aviles	ECL	73		Natural resources: “...while the area would provide for <b>historic preservation</b> , visitor <b>activities</b> , and park operations.” “Natural resource objectives..., and <b>may</b> complement,...” (Occurs in other zones too.)	Done. “complement” kept as is.
122.	SH		73		Change second sentence of the description to read, “Landscapes, sites, and select building interiors would be preserved and interpreted....	Zone description changed and decided via steering committee guidance (see committee spreadsheet)
123.	SH		74		The treatment of vegetation as written is NOT what we agreed to for the ECL Zone. In the ECL zone, native vegetation would be encouraged to thrive, but would ultimately have to be consistent with the Cultural Landscape! Therefore, change the wording to; “Native vegetation (including aquatic vegetation) and vegetation communities would be preserved to the extent possible, consistent with the preservation of cultural landscape values.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
124.	B. Aviles		74		Cultural landscapes: sub “ <b>appropriate</b> ” for “efficient”. Further on <b>values</b> , not vales.	Done.
125.	S. Fritzke	Coast Eco.: Veg	74	Veg paragraph	This section is very weak in relation to the NR contributions to cultural landscapes. Needs to be beefed up to define the concept of contributing features (including native plants). Also, nonnative species do not provide vegetation communities, rather, they create patterns (such as windrows) that support cultural landscape values.	Done. Text modified.
126.	AsF	Evolved CL Zone	75		Museum Collections. Change to “Museum Collections (archeological artifacts, archival materials, and historical artifacts) will be documented, cataloged and protected to ensure long-term preservation according to NPS standards and guidelines. Demonstrate to visitors how the park’s museum collection and Cultural Resource Holdings are inextricably bound.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
127.	B. Aviles		77		Sound and night skies: should be <b>compatible</b> with cultural resource/ historic preservation objectives in the ECL zone.	Done
128.	B. Aviles		77		Not sure why encounters with “park/partner staff” is mentioned here.	Done.
129.	B. Aviles		77		ECL Zone: “ <b>New development would be minimal, but may include modest modern structures necessary to support preservation and visitor use.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
130.	SH	Alt Detail	77		Levels of Development and Management - Development may include a blend of historic and <i>compatible</i> modern buildings...	Done
131.	A. Roth		78	Evol. Cultural	For Commercial Services and nonprofit programming, I would like to rewrite my own text as follows:  “A variety of necessary and appropriate commercial services offerings that may be available include but are not limited to: equipment rentals, guides, food and beverage, recreational, equestrian, overnight accommodations, retail, etc. A variety of nonprofit programming that may be available include but are not limited to environmental, educational, interpretive, community, arts, etc. Certain buildings may be leased for compatible uses.”  Also, overlap from the visitor services section should be addressed.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
132.	B. Aviles	HI	79	1	NR: 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence “...and restored as compatible with historic preservation objectives.” END.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
133.	B. Aviles		80		CR: add after 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: “Nonhistoric structures not required for other park purposes could be removed to increase the integrity of the zone.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
134.	B. Aviles		80		Cultural landscapes: add after last sentence: “Select historic features could be restored as part of the treatment of related structures.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
135.	SH		80		Cultural Resources summary paragraph – Cultural sites, structures and landscapes would be preserved, rehabilitated or restored to reflect their period of significance...	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
136.	SH		80		Cultural Landscapes - Cultural landscapes would be rehabilitated <i>or restored</i> to make possible the extensive opportunities we are talking about that make this distinct from the ECL zone.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
137.	AsF	Historic Immersion Zone	81		Museum Collections. Change to “Museum Collections (archeological artifacts, archival materials, and historical artifacts) will be documented, cataloged and protected to ensure long-term preservation according to NPS standards and guidelines. Collections will be made available for research, exhibit and educational programming to engage the public in ongoing stewardship, and demonstrate their direct association to the park’s historic resources”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
138.	SH		83		Levels of Development and Management- Development would include sensitive rehabilitation or restoration of historic resources, and may include limited non-historic facilities...	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
139.	SH		83		Type/Character of Visitor Access - Well orchestrated, please. Not highly-orchestrated.	Done
140.	B. Aviles		83		HI zone – development: “New development would be highly discouraged, but may include modest modern structures essential for preservation activities and visitor support.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
141.	B. Aviles		83		Why do we use the term “storytelling” here?	Not found???
142.	A Roth		84	Hist Imm.	For Commercial Services and nonprofit programming, I would like to rewrite my own text as follows:	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					“Necessary and appropriate commercial services offerings that may be available include: limited food/beverage/retail. Equipment rentals, guides, recreational, equestrian, etc. Nonprofit programming focused in the areas of environmental, educational, and interpretive. Certain buildings may be leased for compatible uses.”	
143.	B. Aviles	IntC	85		NR: “Natural resource integrity <b>would be preserved</b> and restored as a <b>prominent feature of the zone</b> . Visitor opportunities would be <b>supported in keeping with other resource objectives.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
144.	SH		85		Interpretive Corridor – So what’s this zone for, and why is it only about Nature? I think it may be left over from an earlier version of MUWO planning, and I don’t see it used anywhere on our zoning maps.	Retain
145.	LRB	Detail Mgmt Zones (Table 1)	86	Interp Corr. – Ethno Res.	Comment: The same statement in other Zone descriptions for Ethnographic Resources should be placed here. The relevant issues would apply here as well.	
146.	B. Aviles		86		CR: “preserved by <b>perpetuating historic uses</b> or managing for adaptive reuse.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
147.	B. Aviles		86		Are there really NO ethnographic resources?	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
148.	B. Aviles		87		Vis Ex: “immersed in a <b>complex iconic environment where human and natural history is interwoven. Visitors would</b> participate....”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
149.	B. Aviles		87		Types of Activities: Add “ <b>Recreational activities could include walking, hiking, sightseeing, wildlife viewing; with programs and special events in environmental education, stewardship, history, and science.</b>  <b>Special organized events may be allowed but group sizes could be limited to avoid impacts on resources and other visitors.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
150.	AsF	Interpretive Corridor Zone	87		Museum Collections. Change to “Museum Collections (archeological artifacts, archival materials, and historical artifacts) will be documented, cataloged and protected to ensure long-term preservation according to NPS standards and guidelines. Visitors will be engaged in cultural resource stewardship programs focusing on the connections between historic resources and the park’s museum collection.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
151.	B. Aviles		88		“Outstanding <b>scenic</b> views of iconic natural and cultural resources would enhance the visitor experience. <b>Management of views would be guided by natural and cultural resource objectives.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
152.	B. Aviles		88		IntC – development: “ <b>New</b> development would be <b>minimal</b> and focused on <b>improving or replacing</b> existing facilities...”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
153.	A Roth		89	Inter Corr	For Commercial Services and nonprofit programming, I would like to rewrite my own text as follows:	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					“Commercial Services would be minimal. Non profit programming in the area of education and interpretation may be available”	
154.	D. Hatch	Table 1 Mgmt Zone Detail	90	Line 2	Natural Zone bold description. Change 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence to read: ‘They would be managed to preserve and restore natural resources and processes...’	Done. Changed via steering committee decisions. See committee spreadsheet
155.	SH		91		<p>Natural Zone</p> <p>Here is where the primacy of landscapes over natural in the ECL is counter-balanced by the primacy of natural systems over cultural landscapes. I suggest parallel construction, like:</p> <p>... Cultural resources would be stabilized, preserved and rehabilitated in order to maintain their integrity as long as the essential characteristics of natural ecosystems are maintained.</p> <p>The language on this page for Cultural Landscapes is good.</p>	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
156.	D. Hatch	Table 1 Mgmt Zone Detail	91-94	Natural Zone description	<p>p. 91 Coastal Ecosystems : 1<sup>st</sup> sentence. Change ‘promoted’ to ‘restored’</p> <p>p. 91 Cultural Resources Management: Go back to something closer to the original language in the former Wild Zone: Cultural resources are managed to complement the goals of natural resource preservation and visitor experience. Significant cultural resources will be preserved unless such preservation clearly diminished natural resource conditions.</p> <p>p. 91 Cultural Landscapes: please do not modify this language.</p> <p>p. 93 Visitor Experience; Types of Activities, last sentence re. special events – either provide some examples or make the description more restrictive. This is really only meant to allow for small events without amplified sound or lighting in previously disturbed areas, and for things like running events on established trails.</p> <p>p. 94 Lightscares – Seems like we should also say in general outdoor lighting would be prohibited except where needed for safety at trailhead facilities. I think the text is generally ok but we would only want it at the fringes where there is some development. I guess people might also have camping lanterns at campgrounds.</p> <p>Skills, Risk, Time Required- change testing of outdoor skills are ‘generally important’ to ‘may be important’ to most visitors accessing this zone</p> <p>Type/Character of Visitor Access – add to the vehicular access paragraph that generally these destinations and access points are on the periphery of the zone</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>See steering committee guidance spreadsheet</p> <p>OK. Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Retain.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
157.	B. Aviles	Nat	91		CR: add “Nonhistoric features could be removed to support natural resource objectives.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
158.	AsF	Natural Zone	92		Museum Collection. Change to “Museum Collections (archeological artifacts, archival materials, and historical artifacts) will be documented, cataloged and protected to ensure long-term preservation according to NPS standards and guidelines. Natural History collections will be made available for research, exhibit and educational programming to engage the public in ongoing stewardship, and demonstrate their direct association to the park’s historic resources”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
159.	B. Aviles		93		Views: “ <b>An abundance of outstanding scenic</b> views of iconic natural and cultural resources would enhance the visitor experience. <b>Management of view would be minimal.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
160.	B. Aviles		94		Skills, risk: REVISE “ <b>Universal access opportunities would be developed to provide representative experiences for disabled visitors. However, much of the zone would not be accessible to visitors with mobility disabilities.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
161.	B. Aviles		94		Nat – development: “ <b>New development... aimed at improving or replacing essential facilities...</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
162.	B. Aviles		94		Access: should emphasize priority for <b>walking</b> or use of trails?	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
163.	A Roth		95	natural	For Commercial Services and nonprofit programming, I would like to rewrite my own text as follows:  “Commercial Services would be minimal, such as guided activities. Non profit programming in the area of education and interpretation may be available”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
164.	B. Aviles	Sens	96		NR: “Rare and <b>exceptionally sensitive</b> natural resources...”	Retain.
165.	SH		97		Sensitive Resources Zone – I suggest calling this the Sensitive Natural Resources Zone.	Retain
166.	D. Hatch	Table 1 Mgmt Zone Detail	97-98	Sensitive Zone description	The entire Sensitive Zone description should revert to the previous versions that we worked on that were much more restrictive. Otherwise why bother to have this zone. As currently described it does not meet what the original intent was.  p. 97 Cultural Resources – same comments as above from p. 91  p. 98 Visitor Experience – The current language is not as restrictive as our original zoning that said: ‘Visitors would have the opportunity to experience and understand these natural [and cultural] resources from outside the zone using a variety of interpretive and educational media. Visitor use is generally restricted and regulated.  All of the activities in the original zone descriptions were guided, now it sounds much more open to public use for a variety of uses. Previous language example: ‘Recreational activities could include: Beach activities such as guided tours.’ This was meant to convey that most access would be guided, but now guided activities are just part of a longer menu.  Use levels were LOW in the previous version, unless permitted for special purposes. Group sizes <b>WOULD</b> be limited, not could be limited. Please revert to previous language.	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
					Ditto for Levels of Development, including Types of Facilities. Those described were meant to be outside the zone, not in it, except for trails and what might be needed for resource protection and safety (e.g. fencing, signage).	
167.	B. Aviles		98		Vis Ex: Add to end of 1 <sup>st</sup> para: “ <b>Visitation may be highest at the edges of the zone.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
168.	AsF	Sensitive Resources Zone	98		Museum Collection. Change to “Museum Collections (archeological artifacts, archival materials, and historical artifacts) will be documented, cataloged and protected to ensure long-term preservation according to NPS standards and guidelines. Natural History collections will be made available for research, exhibit and educational programming to engage the public in ongoing stewardship, and demonstrate their direct association to the park’s historic resources”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
169.	B. Aviles		99		Views: “Outstanding <b>scenic</b> views of iconic natural <b>and</b> cultural resources may be available <b>and would enhance the visitor experience. Management of view would be minimal.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
170.	B. Aviles		99		Skills, risk: REVISE. “ <b>Universal access opportunities could be very limited.</b> ” ???	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
171.	T. Williams		99		Dark Night Skies (Lightscapes) – change “... critical natural resource goals...” to “...critical <i>cultural</i> resource goals...”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
172.	B. Aviles		100		Sens Res – development: “ <b>New development would be highly discouraged and limited to improvements</b> , such as trails, to allow for concentration of visitor use and protection of sensitive resources.” “ <b>Interpretive facilities, such as wayside exhibits, may be located at the edge of the zone.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
173.	A. Roth		100	Sensitive	For Commercial Services and nonprofit programming, I would like to rewrite my own text as follows:  “Commercial Services and non-profit programming would be minimal.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
174.	AsF	Park Ops Zone	103		Museum Collections. Change to “Museum Collections (archeological artifacts, archival materials, and historical artifacts) will be documented, cataloged and protected to ensure long-term preservation according to NPS standards and guidelines. Collections will be made available for research, exhibit and educational programming to engage the public in ongoing stewardship.”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
175.	B. Aviles	Park Ops	104		REVISE. “ <b>Special organized events would be permitted where compatible with park operations. Group sizes could be limited.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
176.	B. Aviles				Views: “Outstanding <b>scenic</b> views of iconic natural and cultural resources may be available. <b>Management of views would be guided by natural and cultural resource objectives.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
177.	B. Aviles				Skills, risk: “... Visitors <b>and staff with varied levels of disability</b> would have access to this zone. The time...” ???	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
178.	B. Aviles				Levels of Development: <b>New development could include replacement of nonhistoric facilities to support visitor services and park administration, combined with adaptive reuse of historic structures.</b> ”	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet

No.	Reviewer	Sect.	Page	Line	Review Comments	Response/Notes
179.	B. Aviles				Access: Add at end: <b>“Trailheads connecting with other parks and the neighboring community would be appropriate.”</b>	See steering committee guidance spreadsheet
180.						
181.						
182.						