



Categorical Exclusion Documentation Form (CE Form)

Project: 2020 Compendium updates

PEPC Project Number: 89612

Description of Action (Project Description):

This project would update the park's 2020 Compendium to enhance the park's ability to protect park resources, public health and safety, and address visitor use concerns. It would have only minor effects on the amounts and types of visitor use of affected park areas, as reflected in the Chief Ranger's Letter of Determination to the Superintendent. For detailed information regarding the proposed changes and affected park locations, see the attached proposed 2020 Superintendent's Compendium; the Table comparing the 2017 Compendium with the changes for 2020; and the Chief Ranger's Letter of Determination to the Superintendent. (Note that updates to the 2020 Compendium related to the use of E-bikes are evaluated in Categorical Exclusion 94816-Designation of Routes and Use Restrictions for E-bikes, Marin/San Francisco/San Mateo Counties).

NHPA Stipulation

Any project implemented as a result of the approval of these compendium updates that could potentially have an effect on historic structures, cultural landscapes, or could include ground disturbing activities will require additional compliance review, and Project Manager will work with NHPA Program Manager (Bob Holloway, 561-4976) for completion of compliance reviews and approval.

NEPA Conditions

None

Interdisciplinary Team (IDT)

The project proposal was reviewed by the following NPS IDT:

- Laura E. Joss, General Superintendent
- Barbara Goodyear, DOI Solicitor
- David Schifsky, Chief, Visitor & Resource Protection
- Noreen Schirmer, Major, U.S. Park Police
- Mike Savidge, Strategic Planning & Social Science
- Gordon White, Chief, Cultural Resources
- Matt Wallat, Law Enforcement Specialist
- Bob Holloway, NHPA Section 106 Program Manager
- Alison Forrestel, Chief, Natural Resources
- Bill Merkel, Wildlife Ecologist
- Charles Strickfaden, Chief, Communications
- Larry Miranda, Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Project Locations:

Location: Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Counties: San Francisco, San Mateo, Marin

State: CA

There are no required mitigations identified.

CE Citation: NPS NEPA Handbook (2015), Section 3.3. D.2. Actions Related to Visitor Use: Minor changes in amounts or types of visitor use for the purpose of ensuring visitor safety or resource protection in accordance with existing regulations.

CE Justification:

The proposed updates to the 2020 Compendium will enhance the park's ability to protect park resources, public health and safety, and address visitor use concerns, and would have only minor effects on the amounts and types of visitor use of affected park areas, as reflected in the Chief Ranger's Letter of Determination to the Superintendent. The updates minimally increase time of use in some areas, minimally expand some existing closures, and add limited closures, including some additional resource closures, all of which have either no environmental effect or a beneficial environmental effect. Several areas include no new changes relative to what has already been in place since at least 2017, and do not create new impacts. For a complete list of additional closures and restrictions, please see the Chief Ranger's Letter of Determination to the Superintendent. Overall, the 2020 Compendium updates do not change visitor use patterns in a way that would have meaningful environmental effects.

Note that compendium changes to the Muir Woods reservation system were fully analyzed in the 2015 Muir Woods National Monument Reservation System Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact, and the boating closures for Bird Rock, Point Bonita and Alcatraz in were fully analyzed in the EIS for the 2015 General Management Plan and associated Record of Decision. Although these actions were covered in prior NEPA documents, they were inadvertently omitted from earlier editions of the park's Compendium. This Categorical Exclusion re-confirms that the underlying NEPA compliance for these actions is the 2015 EA and EIS, respectively. Potential changes related to e-bikes are also being considered separately in Categorical Exclusion #94816-Designation of Routes and Use Restrictions for E-bikes, Marin/San Francisco/San Mateo Counties.

Decision: I find that the action fits within the categorical exclusion above. Therefore, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No extraordinary circumstances apply.

Signature

Superintendent:

LAURA JOSS

Digitally signed by LAURA JOSS
Date: 2020.06.17 15:50:53 -07'00'

Date: June 17, 2020

Laura E. Joss

Extraordinary Circumstances:

If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Notes
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?	No	The public use restrictions will improve public health and safety by restricting the types of use allowed in, or closing, unsafe areas; separating smoking or vaping use from public areas; making site-specific, location changes to minimize visitor use conflicts; and improving clarity about individual responsibility for activity permitting.
B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?	No	The visitor use restrictions will protect ecologically sensitive habitat areas for coho salmon, steelhead trout, red-legged frogs, Mission Blue butterflies, peregrine falcons, migratory birds and seabirds by prohibiting or limiting the types of visitor use allowed in habitat for these species. The visitor use restrictions only have minor effects on recreation lands and waters by limiting the type of activity allowed in an area but otherwise allowing other types of public use to continue; closing limited geographic areas to public use for safety or resource protection; or making slight adjustments in visitor use hours. The commercial dog walking permit requirement is unchanged from the 2017 Compendium, and would continue to limit the number of dogs each commercial dog walker could handle at one time and restrict this use to designated areas in order to protect park resources and reduce visitor use conflicts from large numbers of dogs. None of the changes affect cultural resources, national natural landmarks, floodplains or aquifers. There are no wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers or prime farmlands in GGNRA.
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?	No	These limited public use closures and restrictions do not have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflict concerning alternative uses of available resources because they are narrowly tailored to restrict uses in and around mapped sensitive habitat areas or areas where unsafe conditions are known to be present. Safety-related restrictions and the continuation of commercial dog walking permit requirements improve conditions for children, visitors, employees and volunteers. Resource-related restrictions will cause only minor adjustments to land use patterns. Visitors will still have the ability to access and recreate in the vast majority of each affected park area.
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	These clarifications and adjustments are narrowly tailored and limited in scope. They have been reviewed by park staff and specialists and no resulting uncertain environmental effects have been identified. The visitor use restrictions affect limited areas or certain types of visitor use, and some requirements, such as permit requirements for commercial dog walking, are simply extensions of existing requirements and do not change existing programs or environmental conditions. The restrictions are designed to protect human health and safety in areas where unsafe conditions exist and mapped habitat areas for sensitive species.
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	These actions do not establish a precedent for future action as each year the Superintendent's compendium is evaluated for any necessary changes. These actions also do not represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects, as they are minor in nature.
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively	No	These actions are anticipated to have a beneficial environmental effect; no cumulatively significant effects have been identified. The Compendium changes evaluated in this Categorical Exclusion have independent merit and are needed regardless of changes in the use

significant, environmental effects?		of E-bikes, which are evaluated in Categorical Exclusion #94816-Designation of Routes and Use Restrictions for E-bikes, Marin/San Francisco/San Mateo Counties. Together, the cumulative impacts of both proposals are less than significant.
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?	No	No adverse effects identified. (See attached NHPA documentation).
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?	No	The public use restrictions will protect habitat for listed and sensitive species such as coho salmon, steelhead trout, red-legged frogs, Mission Blue butterflies, peregrine falcons and migratory birds. No significant impacts would occur.
I. Violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	The public use restrictions would not violate state, local or tribal law and are consistent with NPS regulations.
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898)?	No	The public use restrictions are limited geographically or temporally. As a result, there would only be marginal changes in visitor use patterns.
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?	No	The changes do not restrict or limit access to ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners and does not affect the physical integrity of these sacred sites in any way. As described above, the changes would have only minor effects on the amount and type of visitor use of affected areas, while enhancing the park's ability to protect resources.
L. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?	No	The compendium changes would not increase the spread of non-native species or weeds and could decrease the spread of invasive species by protecting sensitive habitat areas from certain forms of human use.