

## GOGA TEAM DRAFT GMP – PART II - Aviles

NO.	INITIAL	SECT.	PAGE	LINE	COMMENT	RESPONSE/ NOTES
1.	BA	All			<p>We need to clear up the terminology used to describe “the park.” There are too many different formulations:                      the park                      the parks                      the park and monument                      Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Muir Woods National Monument                      GGNRA...                      These appear in Part 1, but are more confusing in the early sections of Part 2. I suggest: “the park” as the overall term, and treat Muir Woods (the monument) as part of it. This would be similar to Alcatraz, Ocean Beach, Rancho...                      It could also help reduce the redundancy of the impact analysis, although that may be inescapable given the structure of NEPA documents.</p>	
2.	BA	All			<p>Document uses “visitor opportunities” and “visitor experiences” almost interchangeably, and perhaps incorrectly. A careful review would be worthwhile. “<b>Visitor experiences</b>” is the more appropriate NPS term for the category of things visitors can do. [Purge all vestiges of USFS terminology: ROS stuff.] No harm in saying visitors have opportunities; more concerned about using it as a category.</p>	
3.	BA	All			<p>Need common construction for using the term “staff” or “NPS personnel”. In several places it could be simplified to “NPS”. (Page 423, line 5.)</p>	
4.	BA	All			<p>Standardize the size of the park. Best round number is 80,000 acres. (Chris Powell can verify.)</p>	
5.	BA	TOC	vi		<p>Is it possible to combine Cumulative Impacts for GGNRA and Muir Woods in one section.</p>	
6.	BA	TOC	vii		<p>Are all the appendixes listed and necessary? For example, why list special status species if identified in the Affected Environment section? If we list these, then do we also list “Classified Structures”?                      Where is the information for “Transportation Services” and “San Mateo Trails”?</p>	
7.	BA	INT	337	10	<p>Middle paragraph is confusing, especially last sentence: “combined?”  <b>GGNR AREA (line 12)</b></p>	
8.	BA	SUM	339	?	<p>I recommend we separate “dismissed” from “retained”, so reader can more quickly see what was analyzed.                      The rationale statements are very thorough, but perhaps too long in cases. This</p>	
9.	BA	SUM	343-4	?	<p>Farmland management needs review. Maybe this shouldn’t be dismissed?                      Is there prime farmland in the jurisdictional boundary besides the 2-acre area?                      The Aenlle property is not in the boundary; nor are the other cultivated areas on Hwy 1.                      “According to NCRS... <b>the only prime and unique farmland in the park is approximately 2-acres in Rancho Corral de Tierra. This is the corner of a larger agricultural field (approximately 12-acres) that is currently leased to a private operator...</b>”</p>	

## GOGA TEAM DRAFT GMP – PART II - Aviles

NO.	INITIAL	SECT.	PAGE	LINE	COMMENT	RESPONSE/ NOTES
					Seems like this is the time to describe the impact if we were to discontinue agricultural production. Negligible?	
10.	BA	SUM	348	?	Visitor Exp.: format issue. Also, insert “ <b>of recreation</b> ” after types.	
11.	BA	SUM	352	?	Cut second sentence from NPS Operations. [Trim the document.]	
12.	BA	SUM	353	?	Staffing: importance is unclear. “...NPS staffing, <b>potentially effecting the ability of park staff to fulfill the legislated purposes of the parks.</b> ”	
13.	BA	Coord	753	?	Delete Redwood Ramble and Sweeney Saunter. Not organizations.	
14.	BA	Coord	756	?	Do you really need full bios for all listed staff? This will be a considerable effort. If so, let’s make it a specific request since not everyone listed will see this note. We should review steering committee list and need to create so many distinctions. Hurst, Powell, Roth, Mannell, Ruan, Savidge, and Weideman have similar roles. How could you forget Abby sue Fisher?! Just list by organizational unit: GOGA, GGNPC, DSC, PWRO, Other NPS, Consultants...	
15.	BA	IMP	509	All	We should be careful to state that No Action would result in <b>impairment</b> to any resources. No park would ever really do that, even though it makes the action alternatives sound more urgent.	
16.	BA	IMP	522	9-12	Paragraph is not necessary. No need to describe visitor interests here.	
17.	BA		526	17	Should we say that a major adverse impact would effect the ability of the park to accomplish its <b>purpose</b> ; preserve resources and offer national park experiences?	