

# Steering Committee Workshop November 3 - 5, 2009

#2

Page	Line	Initial	Actions Common to All Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
107		SN	Suggest Changing title on page 107 to "Common to all alternatives" (delete "Actions" at beginning)	Decision: New title on page 107 – "Actions Common to all alternatives" But also add Intro paragraph or preamble to this chapter on the next page that explains what this title means relative to the Action Alternatives and the No Action Alternative. <b>STEPHAN</b>	Title changed.  June will draft intro paragraph.
110	14	BM	Does offshore boundary shift with change in mean high tide line— or is it fixed as of a certain date? Also suggest including that boundary extends 0.25 mile "seaward" from the mean high tide line.	Decision: Disregard first comment from Bill M. about shift. But, add "seaward" on line 7 on page 110. "...0.25 mile seaward off shore".	Done
110	29	NH	Boundaries Add a new property: 800 acre parcel Rancho Ridgetop #2: private property, adjacent to RCdT and SF Watershed lands, accessed by road through the RCdT property. This parcel provides important continuity and habitat connectivity between other protected lands. Current hunting activities not compatible with adjacent recreational uses.	Decision: OK as is. Nancy withdrew it. Disregard comment.	
110	15-17 & 26	TW	Need to clarify the intent of these two statements regarding the state lands lease.	Not discussed or addressed at Nov. 3 to 5 meetings	Highlighted in text. Review with park staff. Also check new info from MB via email
112			Nancy added comment about adding undeveloped portion of the County Jail property to list, as long as the City/Cty of San Fran would not object to inclusion.	Decision: Include County Jail property in list. (Confirm that SF will not object before printing)	Done. Brian discussed with Nancy and decided to include the San Francisco jail property in the list of "Potential Future Boundary Adjustments" and on accompanying map. Craig added to boundary adjustment map. Draft text for jail narrative also provided.
112		BA	Global comment. Do document search for "McNee Ranch" and delete "State Park" anytime it's referenced. McNee Ranch is not a State Park.	Decision: Not discussed. But should be incorporated due to inaccuracy.	Done in both parts
111	1	BA	Add "...Tierra unit. <b>The residence, with a functioning well, septic</b>	Decision: Add Brian's suggested text to p. 111 on	Done

Page	Line	Initial	Actions Common to All Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			system, and solar panel complex, could be retained for environmental education, park operations, or other park purposes.”	line 1. Decision 2: p.110. line 34, delete “light” and make “residential structures” (make plural).	Done
111	7-19	BM	Include reasons for acquisition. Similar for Highway frontage.	Decision: Dismissed.	
111	21	BA	Add: <b>McNee Ranch, San Mateo County</b> “This 625-acre ranch is a unit of the California State Park System, managed as part of Montara State Beach. The ranch is the only state park land adjacent to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area that is not also within the federal authorized boundary. Flanked by Rancho Corral de Tierra to the south and lands the NPS anticipates it will receive from Caltrans following completion of the Devil’s Slide Tunnel to the north, resource preservation and management of visitors is critical. The park includes a small trailhead and ranger residence near the equestrian center on Martini Creek in Rancho Corral de Tierra. No major changes in management are anticipated if the land was to be added to the federal holding.  At present, visitors enjoy sweeping vistas of the Pacific Coast and rugged coastal hills from a network of multi-use trails and unpaved fire roads. These routes connect Pacifica with the Coastside communities of Montara and Moss Beach, and lead to the highest points on Montara Mountain. The Bay Area Ridge Trail and San Francisco PUC are planning east-west trail connections that would better link the bay with the ocean. The park has an extensive biodiversity especially on the serpentine soils of the lower slopes where such endangered species as Hickman’s potentilla and San Mateo thornmint, ( <i>Acanthomintha duttonii</i> ,) are found.”	Decision: Include Brian’s suggested text. (and do global search for McNee Ranch to delete “state park”, since McNee Ranch is part of Montara State Beach.	Done
111		CP	Add Thomas property to list? Add Eng property to list?	Decision: Dismissed.	
112	20	BA	Add to end. “This gateway area includes the undeveloped Ng (SP) property, (size), which abuts Rancho Corral de Tierra. The access road that runs across the property would be a valuable park management asset.”	Decision: Dismissed.	
112	31	AR	the park anticipates - I’m not too sure we know enough about the outcome of the Alcatraz embarkation planning process to make this bold statement about the need for a boundary adjustment. Are we talking about adjusting the SAFR/GOGA boundary? Or adding a Port of SF site in the boundary? Would like to discuss with	Decision: Leave Marin County paragraph as is. Remove Alcatraz section. Instead, place in all action alternatives, not in Common to All. State the park’s goals of having a point of ferry embarkation that: (1) NPS has control/authority	Don contacted Brian A. about the embarkation issues. Response is detailed below to the left.

Page	Line	Initial	Actions Common to All Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			Planning team and Mike Savidge.	<p>over, and (2) has some longevity to it (e.g., 50-60 years). Statement about these ferry embarkation center goals should be added to each alternative. The specifics or mechanism of possible embarkation acquisitions will not be included. Also, Alcatraz Embarkation EIS should be added to plans to be developed section.</p> <p>In call with Brian on 12/8/09, Brian gave the following direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Leave Marin as is.</li> <li>* Delete paragraph on Alcatraz on p. 112</li> <li>* Add "Alcatraz Embarkation EIS" to list on p. 42 (in NPS Plans to be Completed)</li> <li>* Add text about embarkation needs to No Action, and Alts 1, 2, 3. <u>Brian will provide text and send to Don/Stephan to be inserted in the "Off-Island Ferry Dock Location" sections.</u></li> <li>* To maintain logical progression as in the MUWO alternatives, in ALL Alcatraz alternatives (incl. No Action), move embarkation paragraph to front of each alternative, right after Overviews. (e.g., "Off-Island Ferry Dock Location" paragraph on p. 147 would move to p. 145, right after Overview).</li> </ul>	<p>Done</p> <p><b>CHECK NEED</b></p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
113		DH	See separate comment matrix regarding Boundary Adjustments (from Daphne).	<p><b>Decision: Incorporate/include paragraph from Daphne (in DH's comment form or in overall matrix)... page 113, lines 1-12. Will be added to Boundaries section of Common to All.</b></p> <p><b>STEPHAN</b></p>	<p>Done. DH text added to Bolinas Lagoon section.</p> <p>In calls with Brian and Craig on 12/8 and 12/10, Brian confirmed that Craig will be forwarding all boundary parcel map info to Jim in upcoming days. Two new maps will be added to Boundaries section: (1) Proposed Boundary Adjustments (five items), and (2)</p>

Page	Line	Initial	Actions Common to All Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
					<p>Potential Future Boundary Adjustments (five items). “Upland Goals Conservation Areas” and the “San Francisco jail property” will be included in the latter.</p> <p>THEREFORE, new Upland Goals and SF jail text narratives are needed in Boundaries section after Bolinas Lagoon narrative (old p. 113). <u>Text for this section is needed from GOGA staff (Darren Fong, Nancy, Brian)</u> Brian committed to sending to DSC.</p> <p>DONE.</p>
118		Craig	Add bullet to list at bottom of p. 118 (Connecting People...) that addresses: <b>“Park is committed to providing access to the collection via park programming”</b>	Decision: Incorporate suggested bullet addition to list	Done at editors discretion
118	1	BA	Museum: This reads like part of the foundation. Does this square with the statement on page x – colored page? This would be a good place to add the decision to locate the collection in the <b>Presidio Cavalry Stables</b> . See my comments on page 202.	Decision: Dismissed.	
118	2	BA	If we add decision to relocate collection to former stables, ASF suggests we call it a “state-of-the-art” facility.	Decision: Dismissed	
118	16-17	DF	This may be a comment to CR staff as well as to the GMP authors. There doesn't appear to be any language that speaks to collaboration with other depositories. For instance, we are in the process of transferring many of our aquatic specimens to other depositories that can provide the public and research community better access to NPS specimens and have the capacity for proper curation.	Decision: Dismissed	
118 & 202	P3	BA	Add to end of the Overview a statement about the museum collection: <b>“In all alternatives, the park’s archive and museum collection,</b>	Decision: Add bolded statement to Operational Facilities section on page 126-127... but not on 202. Brian, Nancy, and Stephen will incorporate	Suggested text added to Park Operations section under Curatorial and

Page	Line	Initial	Actions Common to All Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			<p>with represents a rich chronicle of history, would be relocated to rehabilitated buildings in the Presidio that formerly served as stables for the U.S. Cavalry. This modernized facility would ensure the long-term preservation of the collection and be the focal point for programs that engage visitors in memorable and meaningful learning opportunities.”</p> <p>Is this COMMON? Seems like we are working toward this now.</p>	<p>these thoughts from BA into editing of p. 126 and 127.</p> <p><b>BRIAN, STEPHAN, and NANCY.</b></p>	<p>Research Facilities title.</p> <p>June will wordsearch entire document. Global change of “Museum Collections” to “Park Collections”.</p> <p>DONE. Added text in new “Maint., Public Safety, and Museum Storage Fac.” Section. New text is highlighted in doc.</p>
122	8	NH	Ocean Stewardship Confirm and insert “the park has exclusive federal jurisdiction over waters offshore of former military lands” ?	Decision: Nancy withdrew comment.	
122	8	BM	Boundary is 1,000 feet in many areas, which is different than ¼ mile. May have to present the range in boundary offshore.	Decision: Mary Beth will research and determine how this statement about distance should read. <b>MARY BETH</b>	Check new info sent from Mary Beth via email.
124		LB	Add to Ocean Stewardship  Objective 2.10. Park staff will work with the State Lands Commission, NOAA, and other agencies to identify and formally assess the condition and value of submerged shipwrecks and other submerged archaeological resources, and strategize for their protection, treatment, and interpretation.	Decision: Staff concurs. Incorporate proposed Objective 2.10 as written (on left).	Done
125		CP	Gulf of the Farallones National Sanctuary Visitor Center—I checked with Brian Johnson and he let me know GSA is the leasing agent. They are looking at a building in Pillar Point Harbor. They believe it will be a 12 month process. At this point they have no funding to lease the building even when GSA executes the lease. Peter Grinnell, from San Mateo Harbor is giving a bid to GSA at a reduced rate if the Sanctuary does building improvements. There is a discretionary pot of funds in NOAA at Headquarters—they will make a decision on whether to use these funds for the visitor center. If NPS wants to jointly be in the visitor center, we will need to begin those discussions with Carol Preston, 561-6622 x 201, who is chairing this project.	Decision: Dismissed	
126 - 127		ASF	I’m not sure what section the operational facilities for Museum Collections are addressed in. They are introduced on page 32. Not	Decision: Dismissed	

Page	Line	Initial	Actions Common to All Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			sure if museum collections should be mentioned here as well? We are also scattered throughout the park at sites and facilities that were not intended for operational uses.		
126		NH		Decision: Edit Operational Facilities title to ??? (STEPHAN and NANCY)	Retain
126 - 127		SLF	General comment – this section is silent on the needs for native plant nursery space (such as in upper Tennessee Valley near the Miwok stables), in southern San Mateo with incorporation of new land areas. Also silent and NR/CR offices and stewardship facilities, which are critical for many areas of the park and are currently inadequate. Not sure why these are not considered “operational” as well, since they are permanent needs and certainly fit within the concepts of “parks to the people” and “Connecting People with the Parks”.	Decision: Staff agreed with concerns. Brian, Nancy, and Stephan will work through all of pp. 126-127. (STEPHAN, NANCY, and BRIAN)	Stephan will ask Brian and Nancy what to do with native plant nurseries in the Operational Facilities section?  OK? Does revised section meet this need? See GOGA Task List sheet
127	14	BM	I don't think the facility is proposed for in Kent Canyon, but rather adjacent to Kent Canyon in the developed footprint by the Rd.	Decision: Dismissed. but check if there's wording in the plan that needs to be revised (STEPHAN)	
127		SN	Bold heading for “Satellite Offices” needed	Decision: Incorporate change (add bold heading)	Done
126-127			Address comments/rewrite from Carrie F. for Operational Facilities.	Decision: Incorporate <u>all</u> suggested from Carrie F., with following modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In “Public Safety Hub” section, delete “(need to verify)” in Marin Headlands bullet at bottom of page.</li> <li>Eliminate “Space occupied by law enforcement...”</li> <li>Make “Satellite Offices” bold / separate subheading</li> <li>Introduce stable/curation issue with paragraph in Museum Collections section on page 118. (ASK STEPHAN for detail)</li> <li>Add Curation Facility bold subheader on page 127 and explanation, which provides detail in Operations Section (ASK STEPHAN for detail)</li> <li>In Carrie's “Maintenance Facility” section on 126, drop the “LEED certified” part.</li> <li>In Satellite Offices section... Muir Woods NM - Change to “An office</li> </ul>	Done

Page	Line	Initial	Actions Common to All Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
				<p>would remain in an existing building;...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under same Muir Woods bullet of Satellite Office, change to “could move” from the Old Inn...</li> <li>• Same MUWO bullet, last sentence... “which is dependent upon an interagency agreement.”</li> </ul> <p>Decision: Brian, Nancy, and Stephan will work through all of pp. 126-127. Bullets in the Satellite Offices section to accurately reflect park operations intentions, while providing some details of use, but not earmarking each facility to each use/need. (i.e., “may be utilized by uses such as...”). Keep some details in Satellite Offices list where it is really important. But keep more vague for sites that specific use is not as critical (i.e., keep options open). <b>BRIAN, STEPHAN, NANCY</b> Edit as appropriate.</p> <p>Decision: Tom, Superintendent, and Deputy Superintendent need to affirm Muir Woods agreements between NPS and State Parks. <b>TOM, FRANK, SCOTT.</b></p>	<p>Stephan will ask Brian about this. Stephan feels this should not affect GMP.</p>
128	2	NH	<p>Partnership This section seems a bit specific for the GMP, though partnership guidance is what we asked for... Should reference the Guiding Principle on p 11</p> <p>Insert “Since the GGNRA was established, partnerships with other organizations have been central to preserving park resources and offering programs that further the mission of the park.</p>	<p>Nancy suggests that the writing style of the Partnership section is very different than others. Written as a “How To Guide”. Needs to be re-written. Stephan responded by describing the intent of this section to codify partnership policies/practice of GGNRA.</p> <p>Decision: Keep “Partnership” section. But, ask Aaron Roth to do “modest re-write” that maintains similar approach and style to other sections in Common to All chapter (and not a “How To” style). <b>AARON</b></p>	<p>Awaiting new draft from AR</p> <p>Also see GOGA Staff Task List sheet <b>Stephan and June</b> edited section. Need AR to check new text (highlighted on page 90 of new document)</p>
128 - 129		Interp	<p>Isn't this a guiding principle; seems out of place here. Good stuff, but doesn't seem to fit. Needs discussion.</p>	<p>Decision: Dismissed.</p>	
128	8	BA	<p>Part. Change: “...with the park. <b>By doing so the park has gained greater appreciation and support.</b> These opportunities...”</p>	<p>Decision: Introduction of Partnership section needs to emphasize how partners are key to the</p>	<p>DONE. See above</p>

Page	Line	Initial	Actions Common to All Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			I think the text has to better communicate the reason why partnerships are so important here at GGNRA. Maybe this goes after line 11: <b>“For many people in the Bay Area, the park enriches their lives every day. It may come as an evening run along the coast, a chance to walk the dog on a grassy lawn, or as the beautiful backdrop to a hectic commute. These daily encounters, combined with the richness and diversity of the park’s resources seem to have fostered great public interest in the welfare of the park. This public-spirited attitude, coupled with an entrepreneurial legacy of the Bay Area, has led many people to seek partnerships with the park. The park has welcomed these partnerships as a way to accomplish the mission of the park. Park managers know that they can’t accomplish the grand purpose of the park without such partnerships.”</b>	park. Aaron’s re-write should incorporate Brian’s suggested thoughts/additions (to left) <b>AARON ROTH</b>	
130		DF	Since Redwood Creek Vision was specifically called out, I was wondering if other watershed or broader planning efforts that GOGA are involved with might be described as well (Bollinas Lagoon Ecosystem Restoration, Upland Goals Project). The other option would be to include in Appendix B-Management Plans. The Upland Goals Project also targeted high priority lands for acquisition and protection—I think this data layer was sent to Craig S/Brian A.	<b>Decision: Daphne will ask Warren Fong – Anything not included in the Upland Goals or not in Golden Lands but should be included in Boundaries section. DAPHNE, DARREN FONG.</b>	Awaiting input from Daphne and Darren.  DONE. Also see GOGA Staff Task List sheets
130 - 132		Interp	Is this section needed? Seems out of place.	<b>Decision: Retain section. And, add a few intro sentences that summarize the Redwood Creek’s plan’s origin (as per Nancy’s request) - STEPHAN?</b>	DONE. New text added and highlighted in doc.
133	1	BA	Leave a few moments for an update on Sharp Park. The city study will be released around November 2. Park will have to edit common statement following the workshop.	<b>Decision: Skip for now.</b>	Sharp Park section deleted. Blank placeholder left in plan.
135	1-13	MS	Various minor edits to Transpo section.	<b>Decision: Stephan and Mike will discuss Transportation section issues. Eg. Delete “all” in line 13. MIKE and STEPHAN</b>	“all” deleted.
136	10-11	CP	Do not reference specific online sites in plan.	<b>Decision: Mike and Stephan will determine wording. MIKE and STEPHAN</b>	Done Website and software references removed
139	50	BA	Do we need a section to describe the <b>5 lighthouses coming to the park from USCG?</b> Point Bonita, Alcatraz, and Montara are addressed in the alternatives – although we don’t reference their coming to the park and the hazmat issues they bring. Lime Point (close to Ft Baker) and Diablo Point (above Kirby Cove) are not	<b>Decision: Move to Special Mandates section. Include text that states NPS must accept these lighthouse sites and address all issues related to their ownership and maintenance.</b>	Ask Brian Aviles to find a place in Special Mandates section for placement of lighthouse text. Ask Brian to develop text.

Page	Line	Initial	Actions Common to All Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			addressed at all.		<p>In call with Brian on 12/8/09, Brian confirmed that he would talk with Nancy to determine what lighthouse info should go into Special Mandates section. Brian will send response and appropriate text for the 5 lighthouses to DSC.</p> <p>DONE. Also see GOGA Staff Task List sheets. New text highlighted on p. 27 of new doc.</p>
139	2	CP	Add Cattle Hill to the list...	<b>Decision: Dismiss.</b>	
140-141		Abby Sue	List of items/plans need to be revisited, edited, expanded, etc.	<p><b>Decision: Staff needs to look at this. Focus on bigger, broader implementation plans of park (for the Preferred Alternatives) and things that need to be done for compliance purposes. Brian, Stephan, and Nancy will compile list of Implementation Plans. BRIAN, STEPHAN, and NANCY, while checking in with Abby Sue, et. al. (as appropriate)</b></p> <p><b>Decision 2: Move "Implementation Plan" section OUT of Common to All section. Need to find a place for it. STEPHAN and BRIAN</b></p>	<p>Stephan will ask Steering Committee to review/edit the "Additional Plans Needed" section. Is it OK?</p> <p>June will move this list of Implementation Plans (or "Additional Plans Needed" to Mitigative Measures section</p> <p>DONE. Also see GOGA Staff Task List</p>

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
		BA	For the Alternatives sections for MUWO and Alcatraz Preferred Alternatives (Alt. 3 for each), do not use "Same as Alternative 1" or "Same as the no-action alternative". Since the Preferred is the featured NPS alternative, we should either copy/paste the same text as in Alt. 1 or no-action, OR do the inverse (i.e., include full description in Alt. 3, but only state "Same as Alternative 3" in Alt. 1.	<b>Decision: Incorporate Alcatraz Alt. 3 and MUWO Alt. 3 sections need to be edited to address this switch.</b>	June edited Alt. 3 sections for ALCA and MUWO accordingly (by copying/pasting narratives from Alts 1 and 2 to replace "Same as" statements in Alt. 3.)
152	26	AR	"would remain" - this potentially confuses the reader into thinking the primary site would remain on Port property, suggest an edit of this paragraph to be more clear that the primary disembarkation could be from Fort mason or the Port of SF.	<b>Decision: Edit sentence text. "...would remain along the northern waterfront of San Francisco where orientation..."</b>	Done
159	29	NH	Clarify for alts 1 and 3 the extent to which Bldg. 64 is reused – I suggest it should be the same for all alts. Delete "the"	<b>Decision: Dismissed.</b>	
160	27	DH	Alcatraz Alternative 2 The Park Operations Zone would include the Officer's Club, Quartermaster Bldg and Power Plant.	<b>Decision: Narrative needs to match map. A Natural Zone subsection needs to be added to the "North End of the Island" section, which would include Model Industries and Plaza. Paragraph on Model Industries should be under "Natural Zone" subsection. Also add Natural Zone to Island Perimeter section, which would include Agave Trail. So existing 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence under Sensitive Resources zone should be separated out in to new "Natural Zone" subsection.</b>	Done
160	31	DH	Add Natural Zone to the North End of the Island section. This would include the Model Industries Bldg and Plaza.	See above	<b>CHECK.</b> Not done. Reason?
161	7	DH	Add Natural Zone to Island Perimeter. This would include the Agave Trail.	See above	<b>CHECK.</b> Not done. Reason?
				<b>New editing issue.</b>	Don and Stephan: Need to do global text search and map check for consistency. (choose one name and use throughout)  Laundry vs. New Industries Building? -AND- Officer's vs. Officers' ?  In 12/8/09 call, Brian A.

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
					confirmed the use of the following in all text and all maps associated with Alcatraz: *''New Industries Building (Laundry)'' *''Officers' Club''
161	10	BA	Since all the other areas where we use the Sensitive Resource Zone focus on NATURAL resources, I think we should express that this area at Alcatraz would also be managed to preserve <b>underwater cultural resources</b> , like building rubble and other remnants of previous constructions on the island.	<b>Decision: For Sensitive Resources Zone, add "...preserve coastal resources, including submerged resources, and seabird..."</b>	Done
167	21	BA	Can we add something about the role of <b>archeological excavations</b> to inform the historic preservation activities and become part of the visitor experience?	<b>Decision: Dismissed.</b>	
168	23	BA	Let's get CLR guidance on removal of the <b>rubble</b> piles.	<b>Decision: Stephan, Craig, and Daphne will discuss over next 4 weeks (Nov. 09) to determine best wording. Craig and Daphne should consider CLR direction when considering this. STEPHAN, CRAIG, and DAPHNE</b>	DSC reworded these sentences and highlighted them. Stephan will seek response from GOGA staff on the new wording Re: the rubble.
168	22	SH	NO. You have this reversed. Parade Ground is in Historic Immersion Zone. Rehabilitation and visitor exploration of the Parade Ground will be pursued and the management of Western gull population will be carried out to the extent that <i>the latter</i> proves feasible.	<b>See above. STEPHAN, CRAIG, and DAPHNE</b>	<b>See above comment</b>
168	22	BA	Replace sentence about removing rubble piles: <b>"Rehabilitation of the parade ground would preserve the rubble from previous buildings and could incorporate measures to support wildlife."</b>	<b>See above. STEPHAN, CRAIG, and DAPHNE</b>	<b>See above</b>
169	8	DH	Add Evolved Cultural Landscape Zone to North End of the Island. The Model Industries Bldg would be in this zone.	<b>Decision: Add ECL Zone to "North End of the Island" section, which includes Model Industries Bldg.</b>	Done
169	1,12,20	SH	Strongly suggest rearranging areas of North End, Perimeter, Offshore to correspond with the Landscape Character Zones in the CLR. It is absolutely vital to clearly align the GMP and the CLR.	Staff generally concurred with SH comments.  <b>Decision 1: Address raised concerns. Ask Brian. Decision 2: Edit Alcatraz Alt 3 Map to include trail through Windy Gap area (incorp. into Historic Immersion zone), but remainder in ECL Zone (as is).</b>	Confirm map changes with Craig and Jim C.  Craig, Brian, Jim, and Don worked out revisions.

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
				<b>Decision: Alt. 3 Alcatraz map. Ia</b>	
169	8	BA	Third paragraph is really about the <b>ECL zone</b> on the north end of the island, which includes the Model Industries Building. It's not Park Ops. CLR team suggests we change "stabilized as a ruin" to something more descriptive. "Ruin" and "stabilized" seem incompatible. Maybe: stabilize by repairing roofs, doors and windows, but not used for park operations...	<b>Decision 1: ECL addition to North End section addressed above. DH comment. Done.</b>  Other concerns noted, but will not change document.	Done
169	8	BA	Additionally, CLR team suggests that rehabilitation and selective restoration of lost cultural landscape features (catwalk, guard tower) would be appropriate for the area around the cistern and water tower (part of the ECL zone and " <b>Summit</b> " landscape character area). They suggest that this area is <b>one of the most powerful spots for people to understand the operation of the prison.</b> Visitation could be seasonal, as zoning suggests (no map edits). How much of this needs to be in the narrative?	<b>Decision: No changes needed.</b>	
169	14-18	BM	The areas and protections for nesting birds need to be called out. The ECL zone only promotes natural resource preservation when it is consistent with CL designation. Same comment as number 37 above.	<b>Decision: Dismiss. Already addressed.</b>	
173		DH	Correct map to show Sensitive Zone where it currently is yellow.	<b>Decision: Map needs to be edited, accordingly.</b>	Done. Craig, Brian, Jim, and Don worked out revisions
173		BM	Sensitive resource zone around island should be pink not yellow which would indicate a diverse opportunities zone. Sensitive resource zone should extend to cover western cliffs. Considerations should also be made for bird protections in areas zoned natural in Alt. 2 extending from western cliffs to west rd. and in area surrounding Parade Ground including Agave trail, and extending around north end of island perimeter to just beyond Officer's Club.	<b>Decision: Dismissed.</b>	
177 - 179		BA	Is this really necessary? (Summaries) If so, let's keep it really spare. I would anticipate needing time for the park to review this language.	Discussion on where to place Alcatraz impacts section (i.e., as separate sections OR included as a subset of San Francisco section). Stephan explained the reasoning for separating it out, due to differences in preferred alternatives for SF and Alcatraz. Daphne and Mike feel it's good to have it separated as its own identity (since people will be looking for Alcatraz and its issues are unique). Nancy suggests that it be pulled up into San Fran.	<b>June will reorganize cost tables accordingly.</b>

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
				County section.  Decision: Incorporate Alcatraz into SF sections where appropriate, but otherwise keep as separate section. (JUNE/STEPHAN)	Alcatraz will be merged with San Fran section ONLY in the Enviro Conseq. section
185		AR	Upper Fort Mason section. Recommend either not mentioning any partners (i.e. SFCC) or mentioning them both "San Francisco Conservation Corps and Home Away from Homelessness" . Would like to re-word the leasing line. "The NPS manages a leasing program that provides the opportunity for the San Francisco community to live in historic residences, much like army personnel before them, while providing a source of funds for preservation and maintenance. Also need to add "The Fort Mason Officer's Club is offered to the public for events, such as weddings and conferences. "	Decision: Incorporate all recommended changes.	Done
185		CP	Upper Fort Mason: the visitor center will most be likely SAFR	Decision: delete first part of 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence "A small information center...in the Pacific West Region". Keep remainder of sentence. Start as: "A hostel is the primary public use in historic structures."	Done
				Global comment: All existing and proposed LE and Maint will be identified and mapped. <b>STEPHAN</b>	Dismiss.
185		CP	Lands End: we want to note that the LE water safety staff are headquartered at this site.	Decision: Add note that public safety staff are located there. Incorporate recommendation.	Done
186		CP	Ocean Beach: I don't think this description really gets at it—this is a very complicated, crowded beach with many activities. This description makes it seem idealistic.	Decision: Dismiss	
187		DH	Milagra Ridge section – Bay Area Ridge Trail connection – confirm with Nancy if this easement is in the NE or NW. I think we may have 2 easements – but one is definitely in the NW, the other may be in the SE.	Decision: Change "northeast" to "northwest"	Done
189	Par 3	BA	Should we address future management of <b>Pillar Point Air Force Station</b> ? Keep it out of the planning area (like Angel Island.) There are no plans (we know of) to excess the property, but is it inside the boundary.	Decision: Incorporate Nancy's suggestion that in Common to All section, add verbiage that acknowledges that there are many public lands within the GGNRA boundaries which are managed by other agencies, and that GGNRA will continue to monitor these lands, and coordinate with these land managers, in a way that maintains and enhances the values which contributed to their	Done, but not sure if we captured her intent

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
				inclusion in GGNRA boundary... which may include eventual acquisition as well. These thoughts can supplement the text already found on page 111, under the "Potential Future Boundary Adjustments" section.	
		Mary Beth	Global: State Land Lease wording	Decision: Mary Beth and Craig will work to establish appropriate wording for describing State Land Lease, and incorporate it throughout GMP. <b>MARY BETH, CRAIG, STEPHAN</b>	Awaiting response from Mary Beth
189		BA	Offshore Marine Environments section: Add after last sentence: " <b>In areas where the park boundary coincides with the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve (FMR) the two organizations would continue to cooperate to implement provisions of the California State Marine Life Protection Act. The FMR area between Montara State Beach and Ross' Cove, has been designated as the Montara State Marine Reserve. No fishing, harvesting, or collecting would be allowed. In the area between Ross' Cove and Pillar Point Harbor, designated as the Pillar Point Marine Conservation Area, some fishing would be allowed.</b> " IS THIS COMMON? Add to all action alternatives?	Decision: Incorporate as proposed.	Done
		DH	Map changes.	Decision: San Mateo map needs to be edited to include offshore areas around Pillar Point In all alternatives... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Montara State Marine Reserve should be zoned "Sensitive"</li> <li>Egg Rock at Devil's Slide zoned "Sensitive"</li> <li>Find how much Pillar Point overlaps our boundaries, and zone as "Scenic Corridor".</li> </ul> <b>CRAIG, BRIAN, and JIM</b>	Check maps.  Done.
193				Old map needs to be updated...	Don will work with Brian, Craig, and Jim to determine how it should look.  Done. In call on 12/9/09, BA agreed that we should

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
					keep Fig. 5 1980 GMP Plan map as is, since changing its appearance would be inappropriate and unnecessary. Only change was cropping out the Point Reyes area of map. Done.
195		AR	Adding a Stinson Beach warming hut is specifically recommended. We already have a food service concession, recently renewed under a 10 year contract - the Surfer's Grill, which provides a mix of information, food, beverages and incidentals. It seems like the addition of new food services in this area may be duplicative. There are also a variety of services in the town of Stinson Beach. Perhaps what we need is equipment rental and visitor contact station?	<p>Decision 1: Better definition of "warming hut" and "stewardship stations" is needed in glossary and elsewhere. Be more specific when describing different levels of service.</p> <p>Decision 2: Also, better wording on Stinson Beach first paragraph on 195 is needed, saying that a warming hut COMBINED with other existing services (food, rental, etc.), which includes the existing concession services. (In other words, more food services will not be added in addition to existing)</p>	<p>Don will ask Brian for better definition of "warming hut"</p> <p>In call on 12/9/09, BA committed to discussing the warming hut issue with Nancy, and sending DSC a definition for the glossary.</p> <p>Done.</p>
196		DH	Highway 1 Scenic Corridor. What is the park's proposed approach in the event of catastrophic road failure in the face of climate change?	Decision: In No Action, Alt. 1, and Alt. 3, add verbiage that supports solution for rebuilding/replacing of Hwy 1 in a way that maintains access but also mitigates impacts to slopes and coastal ecosystem/landscape. (which is juxtaposed against Alt 2., which recommends abandonment)	???
197 and 208		Interp	Suggest we add idea of demonstration farms to retain future options to connect new audiences and serve a role in the "healthy parks, healthy people" movement. ** In fact, this is an overall suggestion for all rural areas in the park.	Decision: Do not change at this time. Monitor situation if public comments arise.	

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
197	13	AL	2. LRC and GGD "Could be- would be" confusion- under <i>Lower Redwood Creek</i> you say GGD <b>COULD</b> be accommodated in this zone, and under <i>Golden Gate Dairy</i> you say the facilities <b>WOULD</b> be moved to LRC. Coordinate language.	<b>Decision: Incorporate. Nancy and Stephan will address. (NANCY and STEPHAN)</b>	Noted in document for further discussion with park. Guidance needed.
197		BM	I don't think that the Banducci site with ongoing restoration would be a reasonable place for equestrian operations.	<b>Decision: Dismissed</b>	
197	197-198	TW	It seems like we're making some definitive statements about activities and facilities that would be relocated to the Lower Redwood Creek area – it's looks like it could get pretty crowded there. Suggest a quick close look at available space, conceptual site planning, floodplain protection, protection of MBCSD groundwater quality. Or use some qualifiers – "may" "and/or" "could"...	<b>Decision: In 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of ECL section. Add qualifier to first sentence... "... would be identified and implemented, to confirm the viability of possible site uses"</b>	Not sure if this works.....
198		BM	Why would we propose expanding equestrian operations?	<b>Decision: Dismiss? Equestrian plan will deal with this... wait to see how that plan unfolds.</b>	
198	1	AL	3. GGD- Yes, do say a small # of horses could remain, but do not say "Volunteer Horse Patrol" – leave it open for example: "horses for NPS use". As an option to housing horses there, the Marin Equestrian Plan core team discussed day use at GGD by trail horses. This could provide that horse-presence if that is your goal. Visiting animals could be in the paddock there while people lunch or go to the beach.	<b>Decision: Dismiss? Equestrian plan will deal with this... wait to see how that plan unfolds.</b>	
198	Par 8	TW	Oakwood Valley Diverse Opportunities Zone. Is this shown in the right place on the map? Is the proposed DOZ on Marinello Road included and shown on the map? I have concerns about adding horses to another watershed -- most of Marinello Road is in the Nyhan Creek watershed, which drains to the SF Bay and includes T&E species habitat.	<b>Decision: MAP CHANGE NEEDED? Marin Alt 1 Map. Should be a Diverse Opportunities zone be added right at Tennessee Valley Road STEPHAN, BRIAN, CRAIG S., JIM C.</b>	<b>See staff tasks spreadsheet.</b> Done.
198	Par 10	TW	Accommodating the nursery and Aim High closer to the trailhead should be explored a little further. Where would these be? (maybe this is in Volume 2?)	<b>Decision: Dismiss</b>	
198		DH	Tennessee Valley Diverse Opportunities Zone – last para. I want to highlight that 'youth programs' are specifically mentioned as possibly being relocated here. And I want to highlight that the Natural Zone description states that 'all facilities and structures would be removed and natural processes restored'. Nancy has been hinting that Aim High could remain in their yurt at lower TV. That was Not the intention of the revised alternative.	<b>Decision: Concern noted. Dismiss??</b>	

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
199		SH	PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE. Make the core of the Fort Barry and Fort Cronkhite cantonments Evolved Cultural Landscape. We can still have diverse opportunities but demonstrate a respect the cultural landscape much more. The Presidio GMPA requires us to take the best care possible for the Fort Cronkhite cantonment as mitigation for the removal of the other excellent WWII barracks complex in the park. <i>Fort Cronkhite is the best-preserved, most extensive of these nationally-significant features in the entire country. Let the zoning reflect that significance.</i> We can adjust the fine print to ensure a full range of tenant and visitor use, while insisting of the highest preservation standards.	Craig stated that Diverse Opp zoning still allows the implementation of a range of mgmt options to maintain the cantonment at the highest level.  <b>Decision: Retain Diverse Opportunities zoning. But, also check NHP 106 compliance document to see if we made a commitment to restoring the site(s). We may want to add language that emphasizes the significance of the cantonment (e.g., in Affected Environment), and add language of pres/restoration management for the site that is consistent to what NPS committed to in the 106 compliance, while still maintaining the current proposed zoning (Div. Opps). Staff concluded that changing the zoning would not be appropriate due to variety of uses intended for the site. The site can still be preserved under Div. Opp. Zoning. (CRAIG, STEPHAN, others?)</b>	
199		AR	Fort Bay and Cronkhite sections - The "Center for Environment" as the unifying partner Fort Cronkhite concept does not resonate with me. Potentially overlapping with Institute at Fort Baker. Needs a new concept, something more related to recreation, the outdoors, and national park experience consistent with the diverse opportunities concept. Or eliminate having a concept and rely on the zoning description for appropriate non-profit partnership programming. Need to add - "Buildings may also be leased intermittently to generate funds for maintenance and preservation."	<b>Decision: Delete "Center for Environment" to avoid confusion. Get guidance from Nancy on how to write. (STEPHAN)</b>  Remainder of comment dismissed.	Center for Environment deleted from doc. Done.
199	P3	TW	Clarify how facilities at Forts Barry, Baker and Cronkhite would be managed consistent with CLR and Cultural Resource values.	<b>Decision: Addressed above.</b>	
199	P4	BA	Do we want to include "overnight accommodations?" Right now it suggests hostel could be out.	Mgmt zone definition allow such uses. Narrative doesn't need to be all-inclusive.  <b>Decision: Dismiss</b>	
199	P4	TW	5 <sup>th</sup> sentence. Modify: "...near the beach, replacing the existing chapel visitor center at Fort Barry, and incorporating a transit stop."	<b>Decision: Incorporate recommendation</b>	This makes an awkward sentence
199	P5	BA	Insert "Public serving" ahead of "equestrian facilities." Is there anything else we should say about facilities? Mention	<b>Decision: Incorporate recommendation</b>	WHAT?

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			balloon hangar/motorpool? Improvements to support trail riding that is part of the MH-FB Transportation Plan?		
199	P5	TW	3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence. Aren't some of these operations proposed to be relocated to Capehart and Fort Baker?	Decision: OK. Dismiss.	
199	P5	TW	4 <sup>th</sup> sentence. What happens to the large parking lot and restrooms at the chapel? -- reduce the size, relocate restrooms (or at least turn out the lights), and restore habitat?	Decision: Dismiss.	
200		DF	Under Sensitive Resources Zone (Rodeo Lagoon), there is very broad restoration sentence. Is this sufficient? For instance, one potential restoration option would be restore Rodeo lake to historic lagoon by removing flashboard dam for Rodeo Lake, lengthening causeway (either with box culverts or pilings) and fill removal.	Decision: Change Sensitive Zone title in parentheses to "... (Rodeo Lagoon and Rodeo Lake)"	done
200		DH	Capehart Housing Area Add Natural Zone and put description of housing to be removed on north side of Bunker Rd. in this zone, not in Park Operations Zone.	Decision: Incorporate concern.	done, but needs check
200	Par 2	TW	Is the map of the Evolved Cultural Landscape Zone correct? Include area of wetlands restoration as described in the MHFBTIMP	Decision: MAP CHANGE. Change Marin Alt. 1 Map. Remove slivers of yellow Div. Opp on south side of road along Rodeo Lagoon. Change to ECL. (CRAIG, BRIAN, JIM C.)	Craig, Brian, Jim, and Don resolved. Done.
200		AR	Kirby cove- reference to rustic accommodations - does not meet the commercial services test for "necessary and appropriate" per the above comment when we have both rustic and high end accommodations within a 10 minute drive. Recommend removal.	Decision: Keep as is. Dismiss.	
201	Par2	TW	Include management of historic forest at Kirby Cove	Decision: Add phrase to first full sentence on 201. "The coastal fortifications <u>and the historic forest</u> would be preserved and interpreted.	done
201	Par4	TW	Where is there swimming in this area?	Decision: Dismiss. Leave as is. (Stinson is included, so referencing swimming is OK).	
201	Par 5	TW	Are there additional areas that should be considered for inclusion in the offshore Sensitive Resource Zone?	Decision: Dismiss.	
202	P3	BA	Add to end of the Overview a statement about the museum collection: <b>"In all alternatives, the park's archive and museum collection, with represents a rich chronicle of history, would be relocated to rehabilitated buildings in the Presidio that formerly served as stables for the U.S. Cavalry. This modernized facility would ensure the long-term preservation of the collection and be the focal point</b>	Decision: Do <u>not</u> incorporate suggested text. Instead, add phrase to P1, Sentence 2... "Existing and new facilities...and cultural resource stewardship, including a state-of-the-art museum collection facility."	Done at editors discretion <b>Check</b>

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			<p><b>for programs that engage visitors in memorable and meaningful learning opportunities.”</b>            Is this COMMON? Seems like we are working toward this now.</p>		
203	P3	TW	<p>Is the area offshore of Black Point within the boundary? If not, consider adding it.</p>	<p><b>Decision 1: MAP CHANGE NEEDED. Add Black Point as Sensitive Res. Zone, with Sensitive Zone extending 100 feet to protect intertidal resources STEPHAN, BRIAN, DARREN (to determine distance), CRAIG</b></p> <p><b>Decision 2: Add note to “Sensitive Resource Zone (Shoreline at Black Point)” section... “The Sensitive Resource Zone along the shoreline includes a 100-ft. offshore buffer to protect intertidal resources.”</b></p> <p><b>Decision: Jim should add a 100 ft. buffer note along Black Rock to identify buffer... similar to the 300-ft. Alcatraz buffer line/note. JIM C.</b></p>	Done
203	P5, p6	TW	<p>Include continued preservation of dark night skies in these areas.</p>	<p><b>Decision: In Lands End and Fort Miley ECL sections, add sentence that references/further supports the preservation of dark night skies in these areas.</b></p>	
203		BA		<p><b>Decision: Add note about 100 ft. buffer along shoreline of Fort Mason. Addressed above.</b></p>	
203		DF	<p>I might be missing something here, but is there a reason that there is no marine/estuarine resource designation for the areas off of Lower Fort Mason and Black Point?? The shoreline of Black Point is described in the text as Sensitive Resource Zone in Alts 1-3 (Page 203)</p>	<p><b>Decision: See above comment about Black Point map change.</b></p>	
203		NH	<p>Fort Miley            Insert “historic” before “warehouse” TEAM: this was the one place where we thought that the SFUSD ed. Program could relocate. If agreed, should insert: “this site could also host the relocated education program from Fort Funston if no longer needed for operational purposes” see page 205</p>	<p><b>Decision: Withdrawn</b></p>	
204	P6		<p>delete the phrase “through managed retreat”; insert at end of sentence “<i>and restoring natural processes.</i>”</p>	<p>Ocean Beach... erosion and natural process issue.</p> <p><b>Decision: Incorporate concern, but do not use suggested text change. Tamara, Daphne, and Nancy will work with this to address concerns</b></p>	

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
				appropriately. <b>TAMARA WILLIAMS, DAPHNE, and NANCY</b>	
204	P7		Include management for bluff retreat.	Decision: In first two zones of Fort Funston (para 7-8 of page), add language that states that the park “will manage and adapt to coastal erosion and bluff retreat.”	
204	P8		The Natural Zone should include the entire within the lessingia recovery plan.	Decision 1: Check the map to make sure zoning stops at end of the sea wall. <b>BRIAN, CRAIG</b>  Decision 2: Edit last paragraph on page 204 (in Nat'l Zone): “... beach would be managed to protect shorebirds, including the threatened <u>Western Snowy Plover</u> , and allow natural coastal and marine...”	done
204		BM	May want to provide street names = about Lincoln to help with visualizing where this shift is. Note that the designation of the seawall does not match up with the currently defined snowy plover protection area which starts at stairwell 21.	Decision: Dismissed???	
204		NH	Address dog uses at Funston by adding phrase to Div Opp section	Decision: p. 204, Ft. Funston paragraph 1 (Div. Opp.) , 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence. Replace “other support structures” with “other recreational support services, such as dog walking.”	Dog walking doesn't fit; the other things are facilities
204		AR	Fort Funston 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 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.  “ <b>9.3.2 Overnight Accommodations and Food Services</b> Overnight facilities and food services will be restricted to the kinds and levels necessary and appropriate to achieve each park's purposes. In many cases, overnight accommodations and food services are not needed within a park. In general, they should be provided only when the private	Decision: Managers agreed with this concern. Appropriate. How or where to address changes?? <b>(Ask STEPHAN)</b>	

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			sector or other public agencies cannot adequately provide them in the park vicinity. However, in park facilities or services may be justified when the distance and travel time to accommodations and services outside the park are too great to permit reasonable use, or when leaving the park to obtain incidental services would substantially detract from the quality of the visitor experience.		
205		BA	San Mateo overview: 2 <sup>nd</sup> para – We may want to give greater prominence to the challenges we face with the addition of Rancho's 4,000 acres, not just the placeless "addition of park land".	Decision: Dismissed??? (Ask STEPHAN)	
205	Para 1	NH	Park Ops Zone Delete "grounds" (after nursery). Change maintenance garage" to "satellite maintenance facilities".  TEAM: we have not identified another site...	Decision: Incorporate two recommended edits.  Withdraw question for TEAM.	Done
207	Parag. 3	NH	Add possible use of environmental education and educational demonstration garden	Decision: Withdrawn???	
208		BA	Let's consider treating Rancho in <b>smaller parts</b> . Maybe leave the big Natural zone, but treat the <b>Diverse Opps zones</b> in Martini Creek Watershed separate from San Vicente and Denniston Creek Watersheds? This would allow us to differentiate important actions, like retention of equestrian operations, location for other visitor amenities, etc. Although we may want to be very cautious since we've given the community no indication of this.	Decision: Withdrawn.	
208 and 219		NH	Rancho Corral de Tierra zoning should change to address the heavily-used area near Montara residential area.	Decision: No changes.	
208		BM	Consider relocating and consolidating equestrian facilities.	Decision: Dismiss	
208	3 para	AR	Diverse Opps section - describing the Equestrian uses as vital is overkill. Also, suggest that we explicitly state that the exact configuration, size and type of equestrian operations may change to meet the new role of Rancho as part of a National Park. Overall I feel the GMP really reduces the management options for the Equestrian uses of Rancho, and is potentially misleading the public in thinking there will be no change to these operations. I think we need to be forthright in saying that over the next 20 years, although significant equestrian uses will always be a part of Rancho,	Decision 1: Remove "A" at first sentence. Paragraph begins with "Park portals..."  Decision 2: In Diverse Ops Zone, edit 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence... New sentence should read, "However, the park would retain equestrian operations and continue to expand programs that welcome and benefit the public."  Decision 3: Before the 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence that begins	done  done  done

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
			the exact locations, type and scale will be a subject of subsequent planning and will need to confirm to NPS management policies.	with "Park managers would work...", add sentence "Although equestrian facilities and uses would be retained at Rancho over the next 20 years, the exact location, type, and scale will be subject to future planning efforts."	
208	3 <sup>rd</sup> para	BA	Should we make a statement about the <b>many demands placed on water resources</b> in Rancho? This will influence operation of stables and provision of new visitor facilities.	Decision: Add sentence at end of 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph (after "...horse camp"), "Significant constraints on availability of water will influence development and operations of facilities at this site."	done
208		BA	Do we need to address <b>GRAZING</b> as an issue here? We received specific inquiry from Teresa Gibson at Mid-Penn. Should this be incorporated into a management zone?	Decision: Dismiss	
209	P5	BA	SFPUC: Add at end of para. <b>"The National Park Service would collaborate with SFPUC in creating a watershed visitor education center near the Pulgas Water Temple on Cañada Road, as described in the 2004 Peninsula Watershed Management Plan.</b>	Decision: Add as new paragraph at end of Scenic Corridor Zone section. Use exact wording on left	Done (new sentence, not new paragraph)
214		SH	Please consider making Fort Cronkhite and Fort Barry cantonments ECL not DO Zone.	Decision: Dismiss	
215	Map	TW	Is the little area of Diverse Opportunities Zone to the east of the Trailhead/Miwok Stables area in the correct location?	Decision: Dismiss	
221	P1	TW	<b>These are solid guiding principles for managing in the face of climate change. We should be proposing this in all alternatives.</b>	Decision: Dismiss	
221 227		DH	Diverse Opportunities Zone: I think we need to strengthen our response to climate change by at least mentioning planned retreat and reduction and relocation of facilities to other upland areas near Stinson Beach as sea level rises.  In Both Zones – 2 <sup>nd</sup> para. We may want to add 'through managed retreat and other non-hardened shoreline solutions' to preserve flexibility.	Decision: ADD Nancy's text that Nancy develops to all Alternatives. (NANCY)	
225	P4	TW	<b>For Alternative 2, it seems like some (if not all) of the marine environment described as "Scenic Zone" should be in the Natural Zone.</b>	Decision: Dismiss	
228	P4	TW	In Overview section. 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentences. Suggest incorporating this language into the Preferred Alternative.	Decision: Modify 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence... Change to: "Park managers would work to preserve and restore these interconnected coastal ecosystems through collaborative..." -AND-	done

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
				COPY this modified full sentence to p. 195 in Overview section... place after "...wilderness next door."	done
229	Sweeny	DH	Natural Zone – last sentence. What does 'enhanced' mean for SF Bay Discovery Site?	Decision: 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph in Sweeney section. Change to "...would be preserved and interpreted"	done
231	P2	TW	Need to revise this text. Some of these areas are zoned as Sensitive Zone. I agree that the remainder of the areas should be in the Natural Zone, but the map shows them as Scenic Corridor.	Decision: Done	
231	Marin	DH	Change Natural Zone to Scenic Corridor. Add the portion of the Pillar Point State Marine Conservation Area that is within the GOGA boundary in the text for the Scenic Corridor.  Add Sensitive Zone for Egg Rock (Devil's Slide) Special Closure area 300' west of Egg Rock and 1000' east of Egg Rock. Also add to Sensitive Zone the Montara State Marine Reserve portion within GOGA boundary. These also need to be added/corrected on the map.	Decision: Done. Map edits should clarify/resolve??	
236		DH	Change Natural Zone to Scenic Corridor except as described on # 120 above for Sensitive Zone. 2 maps need corrections to marine environment.	Decision: Done ??? (Ask Stephan)	
243	1	TW	Reconsider promoting biking through Tennessee Valley in any alternative. This is a very high-value expanse of habitat that shouldn't be fragmented by further disturbance associated with recreational activity.	Decision: No.	
244	14	DH	What kind of overnight accommodations are we talking about at Kirby Cove?	Decision: Use same Kirby Cove accommodation language as Alt 1 on p. 200 ("rustic cabin accommodations") for Kirby Cove in Alt 2.	Wait a minute, page 244 is alternative 3.....
245	23	DH	What kind of facilities are we talking about at the Great Meadow?	Decision: In Diverse Ops, line 23. Change last sentence of paragraph, to: "The Great Meadow could have sustainable infrastructure to support special events."	done
246 & 255		DH	Alt 3 The zoning on the map is inaccurate. I should work with Craig to make this more realistic. Maybe we need an inset map for FOFU? There will be a lot of interest in how it's mapped.	Decision: Fort Funston Alt 2 and 3 will be the same. MAP CHANGE NEEDED. Chapter edits p. 246-255 will also need to reflect this change. (CRAIG, BRIAN, STEPHAN)	
246	32	DH	Alt 3 still has a Park Operations Zone at Fort Funston. We did not say they would be relocated elsewhere in the park. Please add Park Ops Zone to the text.	Decision: Fort Funston Alt 2 and 3 will be the same. MAP CHANGE NEEDED. Chapter edits p. 246-255 will also need to reflect this change. (CRAIG, BRIAN, STEPHAN)	

Page	Line	Initial	Alternatives	Managers' Decisions and Direction	DSC Response/Notes
255		DH	Zoning map of Fort Funston. Both the Natural and Diverse Opportunities zones need to be re-mapped to more accurately reflect existing and desired conditions. I can work with Craig on this. Park Ops zone would be retained.	Decision: Fort Funston Alt 2 and 3 will be the same. MAP CHANGE NEEDED. Chapter edits p. 246-255 will also need to reflect this change. (CRAIG, BRIAN, STEPHAN)  Decision 2: p. 204, Ft. Funston paragraph 1, 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence. Replace "other support structures" with "other recreational support services."	See comment #204
288	13-14	BM	Bridges and main trail should be relocated to improve ecological function—we should commit to this.	Decision: Dismiss	
289	9	AR	Alan Watts structures "preserved" – is that the right word? Or should we say they will "remain"	Decision: OK. Dismiss	
219 and 344 (Part II)		CP	Ag Parcel—Ithink we should try to maintain this as ag use, as this would be favorable to the California and San Mateo Farm Bureaus.	Decision: ???	
334		CP	Is this where we want to add our future thoughts about the ag land if it is no longer viable for ag production (no water or not economically feasible)? Can we say at that time we will move forward to add them to the boundary of the park?	Decision 1: Stay silent on these ag lands since they cannot be developed due to CE's held by POST.  Decision 2: MAP CHECK... At Rancho, look for ag parcels that are shown to be in our boundary... which actually are not. BRIAN, CRAIG, JIM C.	
344 in Part II		NH	Prime/Unique Farmlands: delete language about continuing to lease. We should evaluate this use and determine later. Zoning allows us to continue or change this.. Should also mention that this extends from the adjacent flower operation on the private Anelle, which would not be affected by our actions.	Decision 1: delete "NPS intends to continue to lease it for agricultural production"  Decision 2: Not "historic" (current) Rewrite...to: "Zoning for the NPS preferred alternative is compatible with the current land use."	Done  done
Global		NH	Access	Decision: GLOBAL. Check all Management Zones for proper Access verbiage. (STEPHAN'S REQUEST)	