

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1							
2					Responsible for becoming familiar with concern statement and associated representative quotes, facilitating relevant discussion on follow up calls, ensuring a decision is made, capturing and writing a response	* Make decision to question(s). * Identify what portions of the document need to change (sections, maps, etc.). * Provide reasoning for decision (which will help feed the subsequent responses to comments)	Insert names/orgs that are assigned tasks after decision is reached (DSC primary responsibility)
3							
4	BK1000	36637	Commenters, including the Wild Equity Institute, stated that the NPS should make stewardship of the land the priority of the plan, including revisions to the purpose of the Draft GMP to include prioritization for the protection of park resources. <i>CLARIFICATION: Comment specifically requests that we include new text in the Purpose and Need explaining that since 1980, the importance of the GGNRA in protecting biodiversity has been studied and much better understood. (see representative quote)</i>	Should stewardship of the land and natural resources take precedence over visitor experience? Would language that describes the NPS mission address this comment?	Steering Committee: Recreation	Yes to both questions. Subsequent legislation confirmed that all park units follow the same park policies. (Redwood Act, management policies). The introduction to the park/purpose and need contains a lot of the information that is relevant. Go back to the organic act to confirm them. One response may address several concern statements - for example this one and #36638. Possibly have one overarching concern statement for balance of recreation/preservation, reference the concern IDs.	

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1	BK1000	36638	Commenters stated that the primary purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for public use and enjoyment. They did not agree with the purpose to "offer a national park experience" because of the urban nature of the park, and felt that the park was trying to use the Draft GMP to illegally change the enabling legislation which established the GGNRA for recreation. They further stated that the plan violates previous agreements the NPS made with the various localities. As a result, some commenters felt that the Draft GMP should be considered unlawful. Commenters also stated that recreation should be the highest priority of the GGNRA, suggesting that there should be more emphasis on increasing recreation within the Draft GMP. Further, the GGNRA should not attempt to control or limit visitor access and recreational opportunities. The DogPAC of San Francisco requested that the language "Aggressively Administer" and "Controlled Access" be removed from the Draft GMP.	Should recreation be "the highest priority" for management? Should we revise the purpose for GGNRA to address concerns about recreation and open space in an urban area (i.e., to more closely reflect the enabling legislation) or should we retain it as is? Should we retain the wording "aggressively administer..." and "controlled access..." or revise (e.g. tone it down or consider removing from "natural zone")? Does the plan violate previous agreements and if so, which ones? The final comment about "aggressively" administering is related to the description of the NATURAL ZONE.)	Steering Committee: Recreation	No to first question, recreation should not be the highest priority for management. Visitor experiences attempt to describe the breadth of experiences. Visitor numbers have changed since 1980, there are more people now, therefore regulate activities more to protect resources. We could expand the purpose statement section to quote legislation, how it was developed, quote the document that has the full legislation in it. Response should make clear that we are not intending to change the purpose from the legislation, and that it does reflect the legislation. Not all Recreational uses are equal - education, understanding of the resources are high priority. The management concepts have good info on the goals of visitor experience and resource protection. The response could reiterate the management concepts goals/or direct readers to that section. We could clarify in response that when we say "visitor experiences" we include recreation. We won't retile "visitor experiences" to "recreation". Cite Redwood Act, new understanding about the resources within the park lands, example ESA. Include examples of external threats, be more clear about what that means. (Didn't mean dogs). For example, things on the boundary that have impacts on the park. Remove the word "agressively" in both natural and sensitive resource zones. Should the phrase that includes "administer" be in all zones? Keep the term "may involve controlled access", but add that it could involve fencing out of the most sensitive areas. Include some examples of how it could be used in the zone.	
5	AL1000	36485	One commenter noted that the Draft GMP only identifies recreation within the "diverse opportunities" zone, and that popular recreation activities would be prohibited in the "natural" zones. One commenter objects to the designation of active recreation areas as "diverse opportunities" zones, and notes that the terminology suggests that visitors may find these zones more attractive.	Do we need to change the natural zone description (and possibly other zone descriptions) to clarify what recreation activities are still permitted? At a minimum, how do we clarify that the diverse opportunities zone is not the only zone where recreation is permitted? Do we need to change the title of the diverse opportunities zone?	Steering Committee: Recreation	The zone descriptions include the types of activities generally permitted. The list of example activities is not the definitive list. In document: revise zones to include something like "the list of typical activities includes, but is not a full listing of all activities allowed"	
6	AL1050	36488	One commenter stated that many Natural Zones are adjacent to urban areas, and should be removed from Natural Zone designation.	Should "Natural" zoned parklands immediately adjacent to urban areas be re-zoned? If yes, to what zones?	Steering Committee: Recreation	no change to document. Response: protecting visitor experiences, the natural zone is not a pristine area, it will have some facilities and uses. The feeling of being far away from the city at places like Ocean Beach is a visitor experience that is special. Being able to have a wild area experience close to the city.	
7							

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1							
8	AL1050	36493	One commenter suggested that more emphasis should be provided on recreation rather than restoration, and that instead of focusing on restoring areas, the focus should be on maintaining the current biodiversity and minimizing the extinction of the species that exist today. (Similar to BK1000/36638, same responders)	Should the overall GMP/alternatives place more emphasis on recreation and less on nat'l resource restoration? (ie, only manage up to maintaining current biodiversity and populations)	Steering Committee: Recreation	Response: Include Language about balancing natural resources and visitor experiences. We looked at Alternative 2 that has a heavier natural resource focus, but balanced back to incorporate other goals. (Group this response with 36638.)	
9	AL1050	36496	Commenters suggested that the Zone Management definitions do not reflect the Enabling Legislation which addresses urban recreation, and provided language to describe the natural and other management zones.	Should the zone management definitions--particularly for the "Natural Zone"--be revised to mention/address urban recreation?	Steering Committee: Recreation	We evaluated the suggestions, some were incorporated, some were rejected for these reasons x, y, z. Response to natural zone being 90%: natural zone does not exclude recreation, includes these types: (may want to delineate % by county).	
10	AL1390	36541	Commenters posed questions regarding the definition of types of activities that are explicitly allowed at the GGNRA under the Draft GMP, such as surfing, family events, running events, compatible recreation, and dog walking. <i>(The former sentence can be responded to by a Recreation master comment; the next should be part of a NEPA master comment.)</i> The Crissy Field Dog Group stated that the Draft GMP be revised to define the range of recreational activities on GGNRA lands, describe the environmental baseline with regard to recreation, and impacts on the recreation baseline of the proposed action alternatives.	Should we clarify the types of recreational activities that will be allowed, and not allowed, in the various zones? Should we further define or exclude the concept of "family events" and be more clear about the group size that will trigger the need for a permit? Should we further define the concept of "running events"? Can we further describe the environmental baseline with regard to recreation, and impacts on the recreation baseline of the proposed action alternatives?	Steering Committee: Recreation and NEPA	Document changes: In Vol I Zoning: Strike "family events," the notion was larger group events. What we mean is larger organized events, not just someone's family going for a picnic. How the park manages group sizes is available on the web site. Response: Reference row 6 response 36485. Incorporate some guidance from SPUG/OPEC - events/coordinating group on permits language - or reference the guidance (DSC has a copy). Response regarding the environmental baseline comment: we've done that as part of NEPA compliance, recreation environmental baseline included under the category "visitor use and experience". The comment is not specific except stating that recreation is not analyzed, but that has been analyzed in the visitor use and experience section. Document change: Doc. Vol II page 115-should we change wording to informal sports. NOTE: let's make sure we have accurately identified the environmental baseline!	
11	AL2210	36633	USFWS and the Crissy Field Dog Group provided several suggestions regarding specific improvements and the preferred alternative, such as additional environmental review of the preferred alternative be undertaken when specific projects are planned, and that the Draft GMP should clarify that new lands would be treated the same as any other GGNRA lands and recreational uses will be allowed to continue (except when regulated through site-specific public land planning processes and associated environmental review).	Will existing recreational uses on new park lands (as at Rancho) be allowed to continue? (Is this a requirement?) Will additional environmental review take place when site-specific projects are planned and implemented? What clarifying language is needed? <i>(THIS IS VERY SIMILAR TO AL 1390.)</i>	Steering Committee: Recreation	Response: Existing uses will be evaluated for consistency with our regulations and policies. If uses are not consistent, they could be restricted. Other existing uses will be guided by subsequent planning. Volume II, part 10 describes that additional environmental review will be undertaken when specific projects are planned.	

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1							
12	AL1360	36532	Commenters suggested that the trees at the Octagon House <i>be removed</i> and open it up to visitors, install and upgrade bathrooms and water fountains at Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, and Stinson Beach, creating additional recreational facilities at Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, repair the crumbling wall at Ocean Beach and avoid adding food services at Fort Funston. Recreation facilities and transportation should be identified as having the highest priority for discretionary funding.	(Some of these actions are in the plan: Stinson Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston facility upgrades, Octagon House improvements, and repair of seawall.) Should the preferred alternative add recreational facilities at Ocean Beach? Should water fountains be installed? Should the preferred alternative avoid adding food services at Fort Funston? Should recreational <i>facilities</i> and transportation have the highest priority? [Many comments relate to the last question about priority]	Steering Committee: Recreation	Response: In response, refer back to the language that relates to these ideas (pages, etc). Note that the master plan for Ocean Beach will guide implementation. We have a range of visitor facilities that could be included for Fort Funston, and they will be identified in more detailed subsequent implementation planning. Document Change: On page 214, "the park would preserve the historic seawall." Abby Sue will confirm that "preserve" is the correct word to use on that page.	
13	AL31000	36490	One commenter suggested that two areas under the Natural Zones should be designated (<i>explain where/how?</i>). One commenter suggested Fort Funston should be identified as a Sensitive Resources Zone, and Ocean Beach should be identified as a Diverse Recreational Zone. <u>CLARIFY: "REDESIGNATED? REZONED? WHICH?"</u>	Should all of Ocean Beach be re-zoned to "Diverse Recreation" due to agreements between San Fran and GGNRA? Should Fort Funston be re-zoned to "Sensitive" due to all of the resource protection needs (dunes, shorebirds, swallows, Lessingia, etc)?	Steering Committee: Recreation	At Fort Funston, current zoning allows for protection of resources mentioned by the commenter. Some areas could be closed, if needed for protection of resources. At Ocean Beach (Nancy: research the language in the agreement of transfer of land from SF to GGNRA). The context has changed, federally listed species use this area 9 months of the year, and it must be managed according to the resource value. Zoning reflects existing use of the beach, as the northern portion is more highly used. The natural zone accommodates the majority of existing uses. Zoning could allow for dog walking.	
14	AL31000	36494	Commenters stated that the GGNRA is within an urban setting with no backcountry wilderness, as and such should not be managed as backcountry areas, and that the only "controlled access" that should occur is through barriers and signs, not permitting. The San Francisco Dog Owners Group stated that these areas currently receive more thousands and thousands of visitors every day. Yet the Draft GMP/EIS proposes to manage two-thirds of Ocean Beach and most of Fort Funston as low-use natural zones. The GMP needs to better reflect reality and acknowledge that Ocean Beach and Fort Funston are high-use areas and should be managed that way.	Given urban setting and high public use, should areas of high use areas of park be re-zoned for more recreation (and removal of "Natural" zones)? (e.g., Ocean Beach and Fort Funston)	Steering Committee: Recreation	Susan -Zoning response	
15	IM1690	36588	Commenters stated that the Draft GMP puts too much emphasis on conservation and a backcountry experience that would have an adverse impact on visitors. The San Francisco Dog Owners Group stated that since most of the GGNRA experiences visitation from the local population, requiring permits or having limits on visitation would have an adverse impact on visitor experience, which should be considered in the Draft GMP.	Should less emphasis be placed on conservation and a backcountry experience, particularly the concepts of limiting visitation and requiring permits?	Steering Committee: Recreation	Susan- lumped in Preservation vs Recreation response	

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1	AE12000	36377	Commenters stated that the GGNRA did not fulfill contractual responsibilities in 1995 and 2000 when substantial areas of Fort Funston were closed under the pretense of habitat protection for the endangered Bank Swallow.		Steering Committee	The way this concern statement is written is non-substantive. However, the representative quote does have a substantive portion. Rewrite: This might be covered under the recreation response. Regardless of past uses, current mandates apply to the park. Through our management activities, we have demonstrated very successfully that we can continue and enhance recreational uses (ex. Mori Point - adjacent to two listed species. we have created habitat and ponds, it has been a successful project of restoring habitat. we have created new trails, allow dogs on leash. successful in creating protected habitat adjacent to recreation. The natural zone does allow for recreational use. (Susan will incorporate into recreation responses).	
16	IM1200	36577	Commenters (including Golden Gate Audubon Society - Wild Equity Institute) questioned the analysis of impacts to birds on Alcatraz Island stating that night herons would be disturbed if the ruins were removed. Other concerns for bird species on Alcatraz included providing more protection for the Western gull and carefully considering the impacts of increased visitation on seabirds.	Are the impacts to Alcatraz bird habitat accurately/sufficiently captured in the impact analyses of the Enviro. Consequences chapter? Does the zoning in the Preferred Alt. need to be modified to better protect seabird habitat from displacement (ruins removal) or disturbance (visitation)?	Steering Committee: Alcatraz Birds	Don will provide change to document: page 200, fourth para under Moderate. Add caveat, "except for Alcatraz Island..." Also in that para add "population viability would be maintained?" Page 244, add "possible major impacts to gulls." In section that says we would adaptively manage to avoid major adverse impacts, add "with the exception for gulls". Note: check for ripple effects of these decisions in other alternatives (1). Page 239: Don will apply same rule. Also, replace "rubble piles" with "ruins" throughout doc. Search for "substantial" adverse effects. Change to "major" adverse "impacts" throughout this section of environ. conseq. Are we grandfathered in for old NPS Impairment rules, or do we have to use new? DSC to follow up. Discussion: avoid changing zoning. We may want to amplify the impacts analysis. We have an FEIS guiding projects that are going on at Alcatraz. We do not do any work during nesting season. It's controlled by the FEIS. Alcatraz is an NHL. One of the primary reasons that people go there is for the history. We have tried hard to come to balance on this. We only have 5 months to work on structures - deteriorating quickly. Can we reference FEIS? There are not construction/work restrictions in many of the areas. Page 58 vol II, impacts on 244 for pref alt. There is not a lot of detail, because tried to keep it on a similar level with other areas. However, there is more detail with Alcatraz Island than most other areas. The biggest impact to birds is at the Parade Ground because it would be opened to visitors. We would have a reduction to gulls, night herons, and cormorants as much as half the current population. Daphne believes it's more than a moderate impact. The alt will eliminate habitat. "Ruins" is correct word. If we disclose that it might be a major impact, we will have greater leeway in implementation. The definition of moderate seems fine. Response: we would take actions necessary to reduce impacts to regional populations. Decision: do not change threshold. There may	
17	IM1200	36487	PRBO Conservation Science stated that the proposed restoration and management of buildings and landscapes in the Historic Immersion Zone (main prison area on Alcatraz Island) and increased access for visitors would negatively impact the habitat of multiple bird populations and colonies.	Are the adverse effects on bird populations and colonies from the proposed restoration and visitor access on Alcatraz adequately represented in the NEPA analysis? Should the proposed zones and management be modified to increase protection to bird populations there?	Steering Committee: Alcatraz Birds	Same response as above. Parade Ground is in the historic immersion zone. It is the only area within historic immersion zone that has natural resource impacts.	
18							

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1							
19	IM1200	36506	PRBO Conservation Science stated that, on Alcatraz Island within the Park Operations Zone, the proposed rehabilitation and stabilization activities to the Quartermaster Warehouse and Power Plant would likely have a negative impact on adjacent Western Gull colonies as well as Pigeon Guillemot nesting habitat and that visitor access to the Power Plant should be limited to the months outside of the breeding season.	Should the Alcatraz zoning for the Quartermaster Warehouse and Power Plant (currently Operations Zone) be reconsidered to better protect seabird habitat and seasonal nesting?	Steering Committee: Alcatraz Birds	Response: visitor access to operations zone would be extremely limited. For rehabilitation work In the park operations zone, there would be appropriate mitigation to protect nesting seabirds for the park operations zone. Page 169, alt 3. text describes extremely limited visitor access, but also notes that mitigation would occur to protect seabirds. (see language)	
20	IM1200	36507	PRBO Conservation Science suggested that providing overnight accommodations should avoid disruption of seabird nesting and roosting areas through human activity, night-lighting, and noise, and the potential for visitors to access unauthorized areas.	Should we add the text that overnight accommodations on Alcatraz would be highly supervised to avoid disruption to seabirds?	Steering Committee: Alcatraz Birds	Response: change made to the document. Change to document: add text that overnight accommodations on Alcatraz would be highly supervised to avoid disruption to seabirds.	
21	IM1200	36618	One commenter questioned whether increased visitation is expected for Alcatraz Island under the Draft GMP, while another commenter had concerns that increased visitation would negatively impact seabirds.		Steering Committee: Alcatraz Birds	Response: refer to user capacity section for question on visitation increases. Capacity, indicators, standards, and monitoring - that is how the NPS will adjust. Volume III page 7. Access will increase.	
22	IM1200	36624	PRBO Conservation Science and the Marin Audubon Society suggested that maintenance and construction on Alcatraz should be scheduled to avoid disturbance to birds during nesting season February 1 through July 8.	Will construction on Alcatraz avoid nesting season? If so, should the GMP text be altered to reflect this?	Steering Committee: Alcatraz Birds	Response: substantial mitigation for construction and maintenance activities that protect birds.	
23	IM1260	36583	One commenter (San Francisco Bay Joint Venture) suggested additional management actions to reduce impacts to colonial nest sites on Alcatraz Island, including having maintenance and construction personnel work with biologists to limit disturbance.	Should the Preferred Alt. for Alcatraz include more management actions that ensure protection of seabird habitat? (to better manage tourism, maint., construction activities during nesting season) <i>See representative quote.</i>	Steering Committee: Alcatraz Birds	Response: we have ongoing daily involvement of biologist on the island. NOTE: combine this response with the one above.	
24	IM1260	36584	Commenters (Marin Audubon and PRBO Conservation Science) stated that the analysis of special-status bird species on Alcatraz Island was inadequate. Specific concerns included no analysis on the long-term adverse impacts to nesting and roosting bird colonies, the negative impacts of increased visitor use, and the negative impacts of introducing food/kitchen services, as well as overnight accommodations.	<i>ALSO SEE OTHER BIRD IMPACT CONCERNS.</i> Are the impacts to Alcatraz bird habitat accurately/sufficiently captured in the impact analyses of the Enviro. Consequences chapter (impacts from use of Parade Ground, food/kitchen services, overnight accommodations, Laundry Bldg., Model Industries, Agave Trail, or possible future increase in rodents on island)? Does the zoning in the Preferred Alt. need to be modified to better protect seabird habitat from displacement or disturbance?	Steering Committee: Alcatraz Birds	Response: the level of analysis is appropriate for a GMP. We expect to do further analysis and compliance for additional, specific actions. There are no T&E species on the island. Page 245 explains this. There are other special status species other than federal and state listed - NPS is not analyzing these in the GMP because this is a parkwide document. For example, state of California, etc. Change to document: may want to add that there are no special status species on Alcatraz Island. Page 58 or 59: "there are no federal or state listed species on alcatraz island". Page 244: vol II. Top of the long paragraph: call out more things besides new visitor amenities, add in "increased visitor access to parts of the island, and management of birds"	

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1							
25	IM1200	36578	The Marin Audubon Society questioned the impact analysis for Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat on Alcatraz Island, stating that the impacts of alternative 3 would be major adverse, rather than minor beneficial. The Wild Equity Institute stated that inadequate information was provided to assess the environmental impacts of alternative 3, including additional information on the disturbance to breeding seabirds from the establishment of the "Historical Immersion Zone."	Does the Alternative 3 impact analysis for vegetation/wildlife effects on Alcatraz need to be revisited or more supporting information need to be added? Do the impact intensities accurately reflect the impacts? (particularly to breeding seabirds)	Steering Committee: Alcatraz Birds	Response: xxx. Change to document: (don has the full list) Vol 1, page 244 large paragraph. Split this up into separate paragraphs. Add vegetation management info: one of the species that uses vegetation is the black crowned night heron. May need subheadings for where Alcatraz Island is mentioned in impact analysis? Since we have more specific information for Alcatraz Island. Discussion: Still needs attention by individual - pages 244-245 revamped. DSC to develop the outline for response, a champion at DSC could work with their staff to get to a final level.	
26	NE1000	36606	The Crissy Field Dog Group stated that the Draft GMP does not comply with NEPA for several reasons, including the need for an analysis of recreation (<i>review letter to clarify their concern</i>), as well as a failure to analyze the impacts to the human environment from limiting access. Further, they state that the Draft GMP pre-determines the outcome of other ongoing planning documents (the Dog Management Plan) and incorrectly excuses the park from further NEPA analysis on future projects. The Crissy Field Dog Group states that a separate Land Protection Plan should be prepared.	Do we need to provide more detail on if/how use is limited as part of the preferred alternative? Do we need to include additional details on impacting recreation opportunities in the environmental analysis? Do we need to clarify/change the description of the relationship of the GMP and Dog Management Plan and the role of NEPA on future use decisions? Should we include language about the need for a separate Land Protection Plan?	Steering Committee: NEPA and Dogs: Sarah Bodo drafted, several comments need response still.	Refer to the page/language that discusses the interaction with this plan and the dog management plan. The GMP does not predetermine the outcome of the Dog Management Plan, and that was a decision made to allow the process in the dog management plan to result in dog walking decisions. The need to analyze recreation is done through our analysis of the visitor use and experience. To do: make sure to address all comments by Crissy Dog Group. To do: Need to make changes to the Sensitive Resources Zone to make it more protective (Daphne). NOTE: the team discussed including references to dog walking in the zoning descriptions, but rejected that idea because it would be redundant with volume I, page 34 text. The decision to not mention dog walking in this plan was an attempt to leave that decision completely to the dog plan.	

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1							
27	AL1860	36497	<p>Commenters objected to the designation of the offshore areas at Point Bonita Cove and Bird Rock as Sensitive Resources Zones, stating that these areas are needed for the kayaking community, and for the safety of the kayakers in the area. The Bay Area Sea Kayakers suggested that more specific information should be provided regarding the management zones at Bird Rock and Bonita Cove including access and restrictions. Other commenters suggested that more emphasis should be given to educating kayakers and boaters on the potential to disturb marine birds, and that there should be more signs informing people of the ecological values at the Marin County sites.</p>	<p>Should the offshore areas at Point Bonita Cove, Bird Rock, and other offshore "Sensitive" zones be re-zoned to accommodate kayaker uses/needs (safety, etc.)?</p>	<p>Steering Committee: Sensitive Resources Zone (SEE CONCERN BELOW -- #36553. Very similar. One response?)</p>	<p>Response Drafted 4/5 (Daphne)</p>	<p>Change the zoning description: sensitive resource zone should not include Kayaking. Bird Rock - 100 yard sensitive zone boundary is fine, to protect seabirds. Beyond 100 yards, we'll have the blue zone (scenic corridor). Daphne will check for consistency with other areas with birds (seabird protection)</p>
28	AL1410	36553	<p>Commenters suggested that kayakers and other non-motorized vessels should be granted access inside the proposed Sensitive Resources Zone in Marin County (especially at Point Bonita Cove and Bird Rock), citing visitor experience and safety concerns.</p>	<p>Should non-motorized vehicles be allowed inside the Sensitive Resources Zone in Marin County due to safety reasons? (Combine with AL1390/36540 and respond to them together?)</p>	<p>Sensitive Resource Zone - Daphne/Abby Sue (SEE CONCERN ABOVE -- #36497. Very similar.)</p>	<p>Response Drafted 4/5 (Daphne) - Combined with above</p>	

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1	AE13000	36463	San Mateo County Department of Public Works noted that Sanchez Adobe is an historic property that is owned and managed by the San Mateo County Parks Division and jointly managed and interpreted with the San Mateo County Historical Association, and that there have been discussions between GGNRA, San Mateo County Parks, and the Historic Association about a potential joint partnership, which is not addressed in the Draft GMP. Other commenters, including the San Mateo County Historical Association and the San Mateo County/Silicon Valley Convention and Visitors Bureau, stated that no historical resources were mentioned in the GMP for San Mateo County including reference to the Sanchez Adobe Master Plan, while another commenter requested that the San Mateo County Historic Resource Study be listed in the GMP references.	Should we add details about the possibility of a partnership with GGNRA regarding use of the Sanchez Adobe?	Steering Committee: Sanchez Adobe	At the time, the HRS was not complete, but we can list HRS in GMP, recognize/List historic resources there. We can reference the partnership with the Association, also with Woodside Store. Recognize Sanchez Adobe on the same level as Woodside Store, but recognize that the Adobe is a more important resource than the Woodside store (greater level of visitation). See wording about the Woodside store as a model for Adobe. NPS will look into funding to collaborate in exhibits/opportunities to interpret NPS lands from the Adobe. Possibly group with this the response to concern statement about the 250 year anniversary of Portola expedition. Opportunities for grouping with other historic resources concern responses. During the final stages of the Draft GMP the Historic Resources Study (HRS) for Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Mateo County was not completed. However, the draft HRS was used all along in the development of the GMP. In particular the identification of resources and their significance was used in the development of the management zones and the creation of the alternatives. But since the HRS was written concurrently with the development of the GMP, there was not a final version to cite in the GMP text. The HRS helped identify historic properties that are listed in the effected environment section, and the Area of Potential Effect in the GMP. We have added language to the GMP indicating that the Sanchez Adobe is an excellent location from which to explore partnerships in preservation and interpretation to enhance our connection to the Pacifica communities and to recognize the importance of the Portola Expedition. This language roughly parallels to what is stated for the Woodside Store which we understand has limited parking. In regards to the Portola Expedition, the GMP will also reference the upcoming 250th anniversary of the Discovery of San Francisco Bay and suggest promoting preservation and partnership based programs for the Discovery Site on Sweeney	
29	AL1330	36525	Commenters stated that a top priority for the GGNRA should be to repair and maintain neglected facilities. Others stated that new building construction should follow the profile of the landscape, and that the GGNRA should remove existing visitor facilities and discontinue recreational uses where continued use is unsafe, infeasible, or undesirable due to changing environmental conditions.	Should the GMP state that priority would go towards maintaining neglected facilities? Will facilities be removed where they become undesirable due to changing environmental considerations?	Steering Committee: Maintain Facilities: Sarah Bodo	Response: Design principles would guide building construction. Reference language in GMP for Stinson Beach upgrade and repair of facilities. Reference language in the plan where we mention improvements to the facilities. Reference the PAMP, park asset management plan, which prioritizes facilities. Refer to part about removal of facilities-removal of deteriorating facilities. As shown in the cost estimates, rehabilitation costs greatly exceed new construction costs. Only one new facility proposed. To do: Is there guidance in Management Policies on changing management conditions - how to deal with rebuilding. Section 9.1.1.5, others. To do: deal with NOAA comment separately. Link this response with other facilities comments.	
30							

Steering Committee Public Comment Response

	A	B	C	D	H	I	J
	Comment Code	CC#	Concern Statement	What decision(s) needs to be made?	Champion (Potential)	Response decision and reasoning (How will decision be implemented?)	WHO 3: Who carries out the task in the document?
1	AL1360	36534	San Francisco PUC urged the GGNRA to either amend the existing alternatives to specifically provide for the option of continued operation, maintenance, and upgrade of existing infrastructure (<i>clarify: where these are located within the park, or where access is through the park?</i>) , or to create a new alternative which provides this option.	Should this option be added to an alternative? (Unclear from this comment what infrastructure).	Steering Committee: PUC	Discussion: Nancy is starting work on this. She has pulled out documents, easements, settlement with PUC. Nancy thinks it's a matter of doing the homework and responding. Change language to state "we administer the easements", not "we manage the land". If there are map errors, Craig Scott will look at those. Marbled Murrette - they point out that it is not in analysis. Brian's 2am list is that we may need additional info on how visitors might cause increased chance for fire. Hiking, camping. Rancho is likely the only place that is not in the fire plan, check that and make a note. And we have an agreement with ????. Maybe reference fire plan for fire comments. Clarify that we would promote things that are consistent with their management plan.	
31	IM1870	36599	Commenters stated that the Draft GMP should be based on sound, peer-reviewed science, long-term monitoring, and site specific evidence. They feel that the analysis in the Draft GMP currently does not rely on scientific evidence and is speculative. <i>Note that most of these concerns relate to dog use and th impacts of recreation.</i>	Is the analysis of alternatives sufficient and well-supported by science? Is additional analysis needed?	Steering Committee: NEPA	(b) (5). We use the best available data, information, and science at the time. See dog management plan and recreation master response.	
32	AE13000	36461	One commenter stated that the text of the Draft GMP should reflect awareness that the San Francisco Veterans Administration Medical Center has tried at least twice to annex parts of both East and West Fort Miley, and that better protection for East Fort Miley would be accomplished, in particular, by amplifying its description throughout the final GMP. Additionally, signage on the grounds should make the whole-and-parts story of Fort Miley clear.	Should we add text to the GMP that the VA has tried to annex parts of Fort Miley? What additional language should be added to the GMP to emphasize the need to protect Fort Miley? Should we specify the need for additional signage at Fort Miley to interpret its role?	Steering Committee: Sarah Bodo	Response: Discuss how fort miley was key in the history of the park. Page 213 of document, add language: "coordinate and monitor with VA to ensures compatibility of their actions" or "continue to collaborate with the VA on the interface between park and VA lands, and compatibility of"... Brian/Nancy to write. Also on page 213, add "Interpret the importance of the site in the creation of the park." Changes will also be made in the summary document.	
33	AL32000	36517	Commenters questioned the \$3 million of priority funds to be set aside for the equestrian center at Rancho Corral de Tierra, suggesting that it seems narrow in focus. <u>CLARIFICATION:</u> There were two commenters and one of them was a representative from the <u>County of San Mateo Division of Public Works</u> . Commenters questioned why so little capital was set aside for parklands in San Mateo (\$4.6 M of priority funds according to the cost estimates), and why \$3 M of that \$4.6 M was set aside for the proposed equestrian center at Rancho Corral de Tierra. Commenters suggested that other locations and needs were more significant and pressing (Phleger Estate, other possibilities in Pacifica, and improving connections between parklands in San Mateo County).	Should we revisit whether the equestrian center at Rancho Corral de Tierra is a priority project, or clarify why it is? Do we need to adjust our cost estimates (for instance revising our list of "priority funds" or adding more disclaimer text)?	Steering Committee: Costs (IS THIS PART OF A SAN MATEO COUNTY master response?): Sarah Bodo	Rancho equestrian center is the most substantial built environment in SMC for the NRA. These are mostly capital costs. NRA - confirm that we really want to invest in Rancho equestrian. Ask Aaron if it is "essential". Maybe split the cost of Rancho into some federal/essential, and some would be desirable/lower priority. Response: SMC is really important to us, but if you look at it in comparison with Marin or Alcat, or SF, the highest priority is historic preservation, and we have a lot of historic preservation in other areas. it is a good reflection of our current understanding of SMC, and a lot is unknown. Could Rancho be reduced and use permitting vs rehab (like Marin stables)? Remind of the definitions of high priority and low priority projects. However, it's flexible and may change as we find opportunities as we go along and understand more about the county. Equest fac do not reflect the standard of design of nps (say more positively). There is a lot of opportunity for improvement. (side note: adobe is not within the park). Response: quick. smc is important, this is an appropriate balance. mention difference of having a lot of expensive historic facilities to rehab at other	
34							

