

GOGA TEAM DRAFT GMP – PART II - NHorner

#	INITIAL	SECT.	PAGE	LINE	COMMENT PART II	RESPONSE/ NOTES
1.		Social & Econ	451-471		This section, although very interesting, is far too detailed and long for the GMP . Please ask the author to pare it down significantly and accept the suggestion (page 460, line 11-12) to shift to more reliance on tables than text. The demographic text should be a support reference – maybe a paper or memo that preserves its entirety and can be cited as a reference. Look at “Golden Lands/Golden Opporutunities” for example?	Modified. .This section’s text has been trimmed down where possible, while still maintaining focus on quality of life and local economy effects. Most of section relies on graphs, particularly demographics piece. However, some text was still needed to interpret graphs and numbers (e.g., in economic effects piece), and to describe the qualitative “quality of life” values.
2.			452	12	Change “attitude” to “identify”	Done.
3.			453	24-25	Change “rather” to “more”Delete “claustrophobic” and insert “that can be” after “feeling”	Done.
4.				30-31	Delete parenthetic clause	Done.
5.				45	Delete “looming”	Done.
6.			454	15	Insert “intense and “before “non-traditional”	Done.
7.			456	15	Change “smaller and smaller” to “increasingly smaller”	Done.
8.				22	Especially for areas that offer unique or distinct experiences not provided by other open space lands (for example, Stinson Beach, Muir Woods, Alcatraz). – should acknowledge that there are many other local and regional parks that will be the first choice for residents because they offer similar experiences clser to home.	Done.
9.			458	11	Insert “changing” before “characteristics”	Done.
10.			458	28	Delete sent (repeats from above)	Done. Editor’s discretion.
11.			458	30	Insert age of senior cit. (over ____)	Done.
12.			458	12-13	Change “kids” to “children”	Done.
13.				21-33	No need to repeat here – only needs to be in one place – pick one (seems more socio/econ than vis exp to me)	Retained and modified. Since the issue relates to both demographics and visitation, it applies in both sections. However, the focus/content in this section was reduced to avoid over-emphasis.
14.				19	change “success” to “relevance”	Done.
15.			463	10	“state”	Done.
16.				11	Per capita or per household?	Retain. Confirmed. Per capita is correct.
17.				14	Delete “as for poverty levels”	Done.
18.				18-19	Delete last sent	Done.
19.				20	Delete “along similar lines”	Done.

GOGA TEAM DRAFT GMP – PART II - NHorner

20.			464	10-11	Delete sent	Done.
21.			465		Mention ABAG’s FOCUS priority development and conservation areas – effort to manage development and preserve open space.	Done.
22.			466	4	Delete “Just”	Done.
23.				23	Delete “bars”	Done.
24.			467	table	Total ave spending doesn’t seem right – not the average of the 4 other categories...	Retain. Figures are correct. The \$43 figure is a weighted average, not a simple average of the four avg. daily spending figures. The \$43 average is weighted by total numbers of each visitor type. Local day trip spending weighs it the most (since it accounts for 80% of total visits). Thus, total average spending is lower... closer to local day trip figure of \$32.
25.			468	12	Insert “and its partners” and include park partners in the analysis on p. 468-469, including employment. Should be available from Bus. Mgmt Div.	Text changed to include park partners. Information not yet available regarding partner employment figures for analysis.
26.		Enviro Conseq	532	13-18	Move to transportation section	Done. Lines removed from social and econ. section. Transpo section will include enough detail on this amenities.
27.					Socio/Econ – too much redundance here with trans and visitor experience impacts. Needs to be sorted out and focused better on socio and economic benefits –(quality of life, pop. demographic and local economy) this section can be significantly shortened for this impact topic, cross referencing trans and vis exp. for quality of life. Check with Paul Scolari to confirm that Native American relationships belongs here as well a the conclusion–	Modified. Some distinct VU or Transpo references have been removed from social and econ section. However, discussions were retained where impact topics contribute directly to quality of life of local residents OR to local economy... which is a subtle, but notable, difference from VU.
28.			532	28	Change “extensive” to “comprehensive”	Done.
29.			533	1	Delete “As for comm.. outreach”	Done.
30.				3-5	Del. Sent “Reaching and engaging...”	Done.
31.				12	Insert “and strategy” after commitment	Done.
32.				13	Delete “and development” and change “for” to “to provide”	Done. Editor’s discretion.

GOGA TEAM DRAFT GMP – PART II - NHorner

33.			15-18	Del sent “All alternatives...”	Done.
34.		533	18 and 20	Insert “and strategy” aftr commitment	Done.
35.			24	Minor to moderate?	Done.
36.			27	Delete “a modest” and change” in SM Co”. to “in Pacifica”	Done.
37.			29	Is this a quality of life issue or a visitor experience impact to those who have an association with the nursery and its various programs and history with the park? Should also acknowledge that the programas and facilities that eventually replace the nursery would offset this impact to some extent	Modified. The offset impacts from future replacement programs and facilities have been added. Since regular use of nursery by some nearby residents correlates to their quality of life, the impact was retained in social and econ text.
38.			40-41	Change “Redwood Ck Vision” to “partnership strategy” (Redwood Ck V. not mentioned in the section)	Done.
39.		616	34	Change “projects” to “plans”	Done.
40.		617	3	Delete “including ALCA is.”	Modified. Alcatraz discussion is combined with GGNRA discussion in the social and econ section (due to nature of the economics and quality of life). Ie., difficult to separate Alcatraz effects out.
41.				This section is 16 pages long– seems too long for this topic (repeats too much of affected env – too much detail) and also seems muddled with the discussion of quality of life and the approach to pop demographics. It equates engaging racial/ethnic minorities and lower income people with impacting the population demographic (as in line 14-15 and 27-28 page 622) Since our GMP will not impact population demographics, I suggest that this section focus only on jobs and economy. Quality of life seems already addressed to some extent in Vis use and Exp. Transportation impacts discussed in too much detail here.	This section has been editing considerably. Several items have been removed or modified. Changes were based on following criteria or filters: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove repetition with Affected Enviro. 2. Remove restatement of alternative details 3. Eliminate all analysis sections that refer to disconnection with some demographic groups 4. Eliminate all analysis sections that speculate on park visitation increases from outreach or population growth. 5. Eliminate analysis of

GOGA TEAM DRAFT GMP – PART II - NHorner

						<p>impacts at a “nine-county Bay Area” geographic context. Kept analyses focused on gateway communities and three adjacent counties.</p> <p>6. Condensed “quality of life” impacts where possible... such as combining discussions on resident access, and programs for residents.</p>
42.			36	Change “contribute” to “contribution”	Done.	
43.			20	Change to “race/ethnicity”?	Done.	
44.			12	Insert “and education”?	Done.	
45.			30	Moderate seems to high for this – I suggest that if we retain this discussion here, it is minor	Done. All impact analysis paragraphs regarding the “disconnections” with some demographic communities have been removed.	
46.			38	Change “community” to “region”	Done.	
47.		618	6	Change “This” to “Its preservation”	Done.	
48.		619	28	Change “increase” to “increased” insert “the” at end of line	Done.	
49.			29	bay	Done.	
50.		621	20	Add economic benefit to local economy of retaining equest. facilities (see Coastside Horse Council comment letter on Newsletter 4)	Done. Statements added to this paragraph about equestrian facilities as well as subsequent paragraph about economic effect of park services, concessionaires, etc.	
51.		622	46	Insert “economic” after “expanded”	Done.	
52.		623	13	“Economic” impact?	Done.	
53.			10-11 and 18-19	Increase in park visitation – if we disclose that here as a positive econ impact, need to address it in transportation section as a potential increase in congestion? Are we able to qualify this? Refer to 1980 GMP where we did project increasing visitation, anticipated	Done. All impact analysis statements or paragraphs in social/econ section that speculate	

GOGA TEAM DRAFT GMP – PART II - NHorner

					modal split for transportation. Can we ignore that here?	on visitation increases have been removed.
54.		624	8		Change “making stronger attempts at...” to “increasing outreach to”	Done.
55.			19-22		Delete – removal and relocation... If this refers to the GG Dairy equest facility moving to the L. Redwood Ck site, this is a very small shift in location, and retains the size and should not have any impact to economy	Done.
56.			30		Delete “more” use “restoring and “ preserving; change “wild” to “natural ecosystem” conditions	Done.
57.			41		coastal	Done.
58.		625	24		Change “operators” to “operation and its users”	Done.
59.			24-29		Conjectural and focused on vis experience – if this discussion is retained, it should be under VIs Use and Experience – not social and economic	Modified, but not removed. Several negative public comment letters suggest that closure/relocation of Slide Ranch would be a notable impact on quality of life of residents, especially their children.
60.		626	8-14		Is this vis use/experience or quality of life (I suggest it’s the former). There would be an economic impact of removing/relocating the facilities if it resulted in a reduction in the number of horses that were accommodated on NPS land. I think all discussions of the possibility of equestrian facilities outside of the park closing are conjectural unless we have data that supports this trend. I suggest deleting all discussions to that effect in this section	Done. Impacts reference economic loss of reduced equestrian facilities, and the reduced quality of life for local residents who presently frequent these equestrian facilities.
61.			45		Infrastructure (s.)	Done.
62.		627	36-43		This would be a recommendation only and not a decision of the NPS. I suggest noting here that since this is beyond NPS jurisdiction and it would require the decision of another agency and a separate environmental evaluation, that it’s conjectural to discuss the impact here.	Done. Qualifying statement about Caltrans jurisdiction have been added to this paragraph and to the conclusion of this Alt. 2 section.
63.			45		Hostel type accommodations for volunteer stewards	Done.
64.		628	22		Insert “and some facility removal” after “closures” and delete “the amount of”	Done.
65.			23		Insert “a segment of” before Highway 1	Done.
66.			24		Delete “large”	Done.
67.			25		Change “agricultural” to “farm”	Done.

GOGA TEAM DRAFT GMP – PART II - NHorner

68.		629	4	Change to “By offering local residents” education about...	Done.
69.			6	Change “can” to “could”	Done.
70.			15	Change “attempt to establish” to “improve”	Done.
71.			11	Insert “at highlighted sites” before “throughout”	Done.
72.			24	Change “connection efforts” to “improvements”	Done.
73.			31-35	Confirm that this is correct statement about the treatment of equest. facilities – don’t think any would be maintains as they are. Retained? Improved public programming?	Done. Text modified to indicate facilities will be maintained and enhanced (with programming).
74.		630	5	Change “many” to “most significant”	Done.
75.			15-16	Delete “community pride” sentence	Done.
76.			24	Change “throughout” to “in” and delete Aclactaz IS	Done.
77.			1	Insert “some” before “workforce”	Done.
78.		631	3	Change “operate out of this facility” to “benefit from housing unless it is provided elsewhere”	Done.
79.			40	Change “can” to “currently”, delete “/site”	Done.
80.			11	Nsert “at ntionally significant sites “ before “throughout” delete “and Aclatraz Is.”	Done.
81.			3	Delete “notable”	Done.
82.		632	5	Delete “all”	Done.
83.				Muir Woods Impacts should be blended into each impact topic rather than be a follow up section. ?	Retained, as per Stephan’s direction on keeping MUWO analysis separate.