

Concern ID	Response	Document changes	Question or Confirmation for the Group?
List one or more concern ID that will be addressed in the response	The questions involved in the concerns must be answered along with rationale and explanations for those answers. In addition, an explanation of how the document will be modified. For example 'the effected environment for natural resources has been updated to reflect...'	List changes to be made to the GMP text as a result of the response. This list will be used to modify the GMP.	Mark with an X if you have a question that should be discussed, or need to confirm your response with the group.
<b>Topic Name – PUC – Project Information and Background – General</b>			
36604 (PUC)	<p>Many specific comments in the SFPUC letter request more detailed description of specific proposals and analysis of their impacts. The GMP is a broad programmatic document and will rely on more detailed implementation planning to provide the details of interest to SFPUC for specific planning and projects. SFPUC also identified concerns related to uses and plans for NPS lands adjacent to SFPUC-managed lands. In areas of the park adjacent to SFPUC-managed lands, NPS would coordinate with the appropriate City Department to address concerns including compatibility with current planning.</p> <p>GMP language related to the SF Peninsula Watershed lands that are within the NPS administered Easements refers to NPS actions as “cooperate with SFPUC” “promote” actions consistent with the Easements and the 2002 Watershed Management Plan. Text describing Alts for SFPUC Peninsula Watershed Easements has been clarified to refer to those documents and to clarify NPS role and acknowledging that these are actions subject to SFPUC Watershed approval or implementation.</p>	<p>Vol 1 p 220: text changes in SF PUC Peninsula Watershed Easements section:</p> <p><b>(Changes shown here in track changes)</b></p> <p><b>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Peninsula Watershed NPS-Administered Easements</b></p>	

	<p>.Trail concepts within the watershed lands specifically mentioned in the GMP were reviewed with the SFPUC prior to release of the GMP and are generally consistent with the Watershed Management Plan.</p>	<p>Both Zones: all actions described would require cooperation with and approval of SFPUC and consistency with the easements and the SFPUC Peninsula Watershed Management Plan.</p> <p><b>Natural Zone</b> (majority of the area, corresponding with the scenic easement)  Park managers would continue to cooperate with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for the preservation of the natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational features of the watershed <u>consistent with the scenic easement</u>. Within this zone, the park would promote <u>improvements consistent with the SFPUC's 2002 Peninsula Watershed Management Plan including</u> completion of the Bay Area Ridge Trail connection from the Phleger Estate to Highway 92. <u>Consistent with the easement language regarding a trail connection</u> <u>ADD LANGUAGE HERE</u> <u>Park managers would <del>and encourage</del></u> a new trail connection between the Bay Area Ridge Trail and the California Coastal Trail on the existing <u>management road</u> alignment over Whiting Ridge; this would connect Sweeney Ridge with McNee Ranch and Rancho Corral de Tierra.</p> <p><b>Scenic Corridor Zone</b> (eastern area closest to Highway 280, corresponding with the scenic and recreation easement)  Park managers would promote preservation</p>	
--	---	--	--

		<p>of natural, cultural, and scenic values with improved public access on trails <u>consistent with the scenic and recreation easement</u>. Proposed trail improvements include connecting the existing San Andreas multiuse trail to Sweeney Ridge via Sneath Lane, and improving trail access to the Phleger Estate from a new trailhead on Cañada Road. Park managers also would promote the implementation of other trails proposed in the 2002 <i>San Francisco Watershed Management Plan</i>, including completion of the north-south corridor through the watershed in areas of low sensitivity. The park would work with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to <u>pursue provide</u> a multiuse trail connection through the Peninsula watershed lands between Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard north of Phleger Estate. Preservation of scenic views along the trails, Cañada Road, Skyline Boulevard, Interstate 280, and its vista points would also be promoted in cooperation with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and Caltrans. The National Park Service would collaborate with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission in creating a watershed visitor education center <u>near the Pulgas Water Temple on Cañada Road</u>, as described in the 2002 <i>Watershed Management Plan</i>. Additional coordination with the Juan Bautista De</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p><b>Re: Boundary Adjustment, McNee Ranch in San Mateo County:</b> The boundary adjustment described in the DGMP states that this action would be for purposes of correcting a technical error and would facilitate cooperative management. It is not a proposal for acquisition and the specific actions that SFWP&amp;S cites are not GMP proposals. Specific actions that may be proposed in the future would be subject to NEPA and CEQA analysis depending on the nature of the proposed action. Text in the Boundary Adjustments section for McNee Ranch, San Mateo County, has been clarified.</p> <p><b>RE: Ocean Beach – not adequate range of alts:</b> The NPS acknowledges that SFPUC will continue to operate and maintain its critical infrastructure. Text in this section of the document (Alt 1 description for Ocean Beach, both zones paragraph. ) has been modified to clarify</p>	<p>Anza National Historic Trail could also be provided.</p> <p><b>RE: Boundary Adjustment: Change “Vol 1 p 108 section 3) to: Delete “Resource Protection and Trail-based recreation” and replace with “Cooperative management to achieve common goals”</b></p> <p><b>Vol 1 p 213 – Ocean Beach” In Both Zones...”paragraph:</b>  <u>The National Park Service would continue to work with the City of SF, CCC and USACOE to address coastal erosion in a manner that maximizes protection of the beach for its natural and recreational values, relocating park facilities out of vulnerable locations and restoring natural processes.</u></p>	
36456 (PUC)	Park lands issue re: PUC: this is addressed in clarifications to Alt language in 36604	1. See text changes for 36604	
		2.	
36452 (PUC)	Maps depicting the easements will be corrected to accurately show the easements, remove any lands not	3. <b>Confirm with Craig Scott</b> the map changes requested are accurate and	

	<p>in the easements and include the (date) conservation easement over the 7.2 acre parcel at the terminus of Sneath Lane – know as the Sweeney Ridge Gateway. SFPUC requested that all maps and brochures accurately present the GGNRA jurisdiction and that GGNRA law enforcement staff understand and communicate GGNRA jurisdiction. Although this comment is not within the scope of the GMP, this is the practice and goal of the park.</p>	<p>make needed changes to GMP maps.</p> <p>4. Make a text change to Alt description for SFPUC Easements (for each alt) to add: “and Sweeney Ridge Gateway conservation easement” to header with additional text: “NPS acquired a conservation easement over a 7.2 acre parcel at adjacent to the Sweeney Ridge Sneath Lane Trailhead. Management of the parcel will be consistent with the 2007 easement and the restrictions of the 2005 USFWS biological opinion for the PG&amp;E Jefferson-Martin Project. The emphasis of management will be to preserve upland habitat for the California red-legged frog and SF garter snake.”</p> <p>5. Include the full easement text in the Appendix?</p>	
36455	<p>The Watershed Management Plan is described in the GMP/EIS in Appendix B, and (also see 36604)</p> <p>Add legislation reference” check to see if already there</p>	<p>Add the first paragraph from the SFPUC comment letter (page 3, under heading “Peninsula Watershed Management Plan”) to Appendix B description of the Plan. Also, change date of plan in Appendix and elsewhere in GMP text to be consistent with the date that the SFPUC uses (letter uses 2001 but their document on-line uses 2002.)</p>	
36380	<p>(More coordination). Consultation and coordination in the development of the plan was extensive and is summarized in Vol III Part 12. Between the draft and final GMP/EIS, additional consultation was conducted with some agencies. Additional coordination would be</p>	<p>Potential text change in Vol III Part 12 to expand on the consultation with agencies – now only mentions a public agency roundtable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add that we also had informal</li> </ul>	

	<p>conducted during more detailed implementation planning where NPS actions could affect other public lands, where other approvals are needed, where there are opportunities for collaboration and consistent with Volume 1 - Guiding Principles for Park Management for Civic Engagement, Regional Collaboration and Partnerships.</p> <p>Specific response to Caltrans, San Mateo Co, others see p 24-25 of LB report</p>	<p>consultation (State Parks, NOAA, Marin County, community meetings (MBCSD)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move “public agency roundtable from p 77 to p 79. Add a couple of sentences about the roundtables, we had 3 (scoping, preliminary alts, review of DEIS)</li> </ul>	
36500	<p>(The first part does not seem like a substantive comment – expresses a preference for Alt 2 and its greater benefits to restoration. )</p> <p>Alternative 1 identifies conversion of unnecessary management roads to trails in several locations, reducing the scale of construction. The Trails section (in Common to All) includes a goal of integrating improvements to the surrounding cultural landscape and natural habitats when creating or rehabilitating trails, and converting unnecessary management roads to trails. The park will continue our practice of looking for opportunities to include restoration and removal of “social trails” and disturbance when planning and implementing new trail construction.</p>	<p>These text changes should be made, though not really in specific response to this comment:</p> <p>Vol 1 p 138, in 2 places: 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet and under San Mateo County Trails, second to last line: change “former” to “unnecessary” management roads (to be consistent with text elsewhere in the doc and to respond to concerns about eliminating needed fire roads.)</p> <p>Same page: under Marin County Trails: insert “to protect park resources in 2<sup>nd</sup> to last line of that paragraph, after “sustainable alignments and design”</p>	
	<b>Ch 1: Proj Info and Background – Editorial etc.</b>		
36604 (PUC-22)	<p>(GMP deficient in description of alts and addressing possible conflicts) Added to 36604 document changes list -McP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Check rep quotes and letter.</li> <li>2. Draft response: The description of the alternatives includes reference to the SF Watershed Management Plan and language</li> </ol>	See text changes in 36604	

	<p>has been added to the description of Alt 1 (and other Alts?) regarding SFPUC approval of any actions that would be promoted by NPS, and consistency with the Easements and the Watershed Management Plan.</p> <p>3.</p>		
36539 (19)	<p>Response: we have added additional terms to the glossary, and have changed others to clarify meaning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add definitions to glossary for non-native, invasive species and change “exotic” to “non-native” per discussion with Daphne.</li> <li>2. Sustainability is defined in glossary (see VOI III p 164)</li> <li>3. The terms: backcountry, aggressively address, controlled access, and external threats are all in the intro to the Natural Zone – team should work on a re-write. We have changed terms to remove “aggressively address” in Steering Comm., “family” events</li> <li>4. Change “controlling access” to “managing”? – doesn’t seem to need a definition</li> <li>5. Change “backcountry” to a more appropriate term</li> <li>6. Check rep quotes for others</li> </ol>		
36486 (29)	<p>Brian Aviles? See detailed comment/rep quotes</p> <p>For response: Rodeo Lagoon and Lands End are not in the Scenic Corridor Zone – Rodeo Lagoon is in the Sensitive Resources Zone, and Lands End is Evolved Cultural Landscape Zone. Fort Funston and Ocean Beach each have Diverse Opportunity Zones in the higher visitor use areas. (other responses cover this comment too)</p>	•	

36529 (74)	Recent improvements to the Point Bonita Lighthouse trailhead have been completed and a restroom will be added to this are in the near future.  Ask Michele Gee to respond re: Fog Bldg.	•	
NH comment	P 207 of Vol 1 – Zone name for TV needs to be changed to “Diverse Opportunities Zone “  Need to re-work 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph in that zone	•	
		•	
CH2 Alts – new elements of alts		•	
b36631	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public and State Parks program collaboration– Michelle Gee writing</li> <li>2. Brian Aviles climate change</li> <li>3. Monitoring/managing invasive species: Response: Park currently conducts actions to manage native pest species such as raccoons and ravens such as by preventing access to human food sources. Current management also addresses preventing introduction and spread of invasive species.</li> <li>4. Language has been added to text of Alt 1 for Sweeney Ridge to include improved trailhead facilities at Fassler AVenue</li> <li>5. Abby Sue addressed Sanchez Adobe interp center elsewhere</li> <li>6. Local residents discount – move to non-substantive and address there</li> </ol>	Text for Fassler response: insert Vol 1 p 217 – Sweeney Ridge natural zone: “Improved trailhead facilities would enhance the connection to the community at Fassler Ave” before last sentence in that section: “Connections to the regional trail network...”	
CH 2 Alts SF		•	
36481 (81-PUC)	We acknowledge SFPUC expression of interest in the property and agree that it would make sense to manage this	•	

	<p>area as part of the SF Watershed since it is within the hydrologic boundary of the Peninsula Watershed. The language in the GMP Boundary Adjustment section states that this would be considered “should the county government declare the property excess” , assuming that an internal county process would be complete before it would be identified as excess for NPS consideration. If included as part of the SF Watershed, it may still make sense to include it within the GGNRA boundary consistent with the majority of the watershed, and for the reasons identified in the rationale for the proposed boundary change. In the event that the SFPUC would not be interested, or to facilitate cooperative management, this potential boundary adjustment will remain identified at this time.</p>		
XXXXX – PUC (88)	<p>language has been added to the alternative description to clarify SF/Daly City wastewater infrastructure easements.</p> <p>Also see VOI 1 p 26 re easements Should we add language elsewhere to address all easements in a comprehensive way</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add text: “Both Zones: work with City and County of SF and City of Daly City to identify the most compatible and sustainable management of their wastewater facilities.</li> </ul>	
36628 (91-PUC)	<p>Re: access to infrastructure at Lands End Also see VOI 1 p 26 re easements</p>		
CH 2 Alts SF and San Mateo COUnty			
36535 (94)	<p>Visitor center SM county locations See p 216 re: safe access to shelldance and ML P 217 “access would be improved” add “safe”?also 219 for ML Sharp Park is not an NPS property, not in planning area</p>	s	
CH 2 Alts San Mateo			

COunty			
36613	<p>Trails  See rep quotes  See p 138 re "loop"  See p 220 re: connection of san andreas trail</p>		
36614 (101-PUC)	<p>seek construction of a "trail" connecting with a suitable beach unit" under the Scenic and Recreation Easement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Response: The DGMP Alt 1 description for Rancho Corral de Tierra and other areas states that "unnecessary roads" or "innecessary management roads" could be converted to trails or removed." As SFPUC suggests, prior to closing roads, determining whether they are necessary would include evaluation related to emergency access for fire fighting equipment and personnel. Text throughout the Alt description has been changed to include "unnecessary" consistently in the document where it is not specified</li> <li>2. Check Scenic Easement – is this a "restriction" ?</li> <li>3. Response: Trail improvements suggested by SFPUC for other areas are included in Alt 1, either specifically, or more broadly with language such as "Trail connections to the community, Sweeney Ridge and adjacent public lands and the California Coastal Trail would be improved in partnership with other land managers" as is stated for Mori Point Language has been added to Alt 1 for Sweeney Ridge to include trailhead improvements at Fassler Avenue as suggested by SFPUC and other commenters.</li> <li>4. RE: Gregerson boundary comment: reference to SFPUC Watershed access has been deleted from the significance description for this proposed boundary adjustment.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Search the document for this language: in some places it says "unnecessary roads" in others "unnecessary management roads" and in some "management roads". CONSistently replace with "unnecessary management roads" could be converted to trails...etc.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3. See 36631 text for Fassler</li> <li>4. 4. Vol 1 p105: delete "through the extensive SFPUC Watershed lands" at the end of the Significance paragraph.</li> <li>5. 5. Vol 2 p 161, par 5 under Traffic and Parking : Delete first 2 sentences. Move 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence up to preceding paragraph.</li> </ol>	

	<p>5. Response: RE: The reference to SFPUC parking resources in the Affected Environment section has been deleted.</p> <p>6. Other comments in the rep quotes have been addressed elsewhere.</p>		
<p>36615 (102-PUC)</p>	<p>Response: Alt 1 text has been changed to clarify that NPS is offering support, cooperation and collaboration to the trail proposals specifically identified in the Watershed Management Plan and encouraging consideration of other trails that, though not specifically identified in the plan, seem consistent with the Peninsula Watershed Management Plan policies to consider the addition of new trails and connectors in zones of low vulnerability and risk and to limit public trails to the periphery of the Watershed in order to minimize adverse impacts (fire, the spread of exotic weed species, direct impacts to sensitive species, etc.) as noted in the SFPUC comment. (b) (5)</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p><b>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Peninsula Watershed Easements</b></p> <p><b>Re-write this section to separate trail concepts into 2 categories: those specifically identified in the SF watershed Management Plan and those that we are encouraging for consideration. Make other edits in NH mark-up.</b></p> <p><b>Natural Zone</b> (majority of the area, corresponding with the scenic easement)  Park managers would continue to cooperate with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for the preservation of the natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational features of the watershed. Within this zone, the park would promote completion of the Bay Area Ridge Trail connection from the Phleger Estate to Highway 92 and a new trail connection between the Bay Area Ridge Trail and the California Coastal Trail on the existing alignment over Whiting Ridge; this would connect Sweeney Ridge with McNee Ranch and Rancho Corral de Tierra.</p> <p><b>Scenic Corridor Zone</b> (eastern area closest to Highway 280, corresponding with the scenic and recreation easement)</p>	

		<p>Park managers would promote preservation of natural, cultural, and scenic values with improved public access on trails. Proposed trail improvements include connecting the existing San Andreas multiuse trail to Sweeney Ridge via Sneath Lane, and improving trail access to the Phleger Estate from a new trailhead on Cañada Road. Park managers also would promote the implementation of other trails proposed in the 2002 <i>San Francisco Watershed Management Plan</i>, including completion of the north–south corridor through the watershed in areas of low sensitivity. The park would work with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to provide a multiuse trail connection through the Peninsula watershed lands between Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard north of Phleger Estate. Preservation of scenic views along the trails, Cañada Road, Skyline Boulevard, Interstate 280, and its vista points would also be promoted in cooperation with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and Caltrans. The National Park Service would collaborate with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission in creating a watershed visitor education center near the Pulgas Water Temple on Cañada Road, as described in the 2002 <i>Watershed Management Plan</i>. Additional coordination with the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Juan Bautista De Anza National Historic</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		Trail could also be provided.	
36616 (104)	<p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Text in Alt 1 description of Sweeney Ridge has been changed to reference San Andreas Trail, consistent with Alt 1 description for the SFPUC NPS Easement description.</li> <li>2. Costs for projects in the SF Peninsula Watershed are not included in NPS costs to implement the Preferred Alternative since implementation of these projects, under the jurisdiction of the SFPUC and included in the SF Watershed Management Plan, would not be an NPS action. As administrator of the Scenic and Scenic and Recreation Easements over the 23,000 acre SF Peninsula Watershed, NPS could support, cooperate and collaborate with SFPUC or San Mateo County to implement these projects. NPS has offered this assistance specifically regarding the San Andreas Trail connection to both San Mateo County and SFPUC. (should we include this?)</li> </ol>	<p><b>Text change: Vol 1, p217: Under Sweeney Ridge Scenic Corridor Zone: change “Sawyer Camp “ to “San Andreas” Trail</b></p>	
36617 (105)	<p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Trailhead improvements are included in Alt 1 for several specific sites in San Mateo County (Milagra Ridge, Shelldance Nursery/Sweeney Ridge, Mori Point, Pedro Point, and Rancho Corral de Tierra.</li> <li>2. Language has been added to text of Alt 1 for Sweeney Ridge to include improved trailhead facilities at Fassler AVenue</li> </ol>	<p><b>see 36631 text change</b></p>	
editorial		<p><b>VOI 1 p 217 “Milagra Ridge” heading - text change: insert “Including Lower Milagra Ridge</b></p>	

		<b>(Connemara) Conservation Easement” in heading</b>	
editorial	Text (see vol 1 p 218 refers to “Pedro Point” the zoning maps call it “San Pedro Point” may also be called Pedro Point Headlands – need one consistent place name.		
36467 (109-PUC)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For Management roads conversion concern: See response to 36614</li> <li>2. RE: “extending into the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Peninsula Watershed.” and need to address watershed policies –Response: the Alt description refers only to actions on NPS lands, acknowledging that the importance of this habitat is in part related to the connectivity to SF Peninsula Watershed lands.</li> <li>3. RE: primitive camping definition – Response: Primitive camping and hikers’ hut are both concepts that are described tentatively for future consideration. Implementation would depend on more detailed planning and environmental analysis that would need to confirm feasibility, define proposed locations and project details and address concerns including fire. Consistent with our guiding principles (see Collaboration) and NPS policy, park staff would consult with adjacent land managers, including SFPUC, in development of proposals for lands adjacent to the Peninsula Watershed. Neither concept assumes use of open or other fires.</li> <li>4. <b>For fire: need to develop this response</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FM agreements in place</li> <li>• FMP - later</li> <li>• SFPUC mitigation measures for fire are in their Management Plan to address increased access</li> <li>• Unnecessary management roads</li> <li>• Already have public access at Rancho</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<b>Define “primitive camping” and hikers’ hut in glossary: team assignment</b>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPS management (such as trails) will reduce fire danger – offset increased public access.</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>		
36509 (113-PUC)	See response to 36467 (included under 'Primitive Camping and Potential Impacts' Ch2, San Mateo Cnty)		
36518 (115-PUC)	Equestrian facilities Response: Alt 2 proposes removal/relocation of equestrian facilities from the Sensitive Zone (creek corridors) or further from the creek and potential relocation of removed facilities to the Scenic Corridor Zone, not entire removal from Rancho Corral de Tierra. Fire related infrastructure would be addressed in the Fire Management Plan? – confirm with R. Wong		
Ch 2 Pref Alt ALts			
36469 (138 – PUC)	<p>NOTES: consider moving SFPUC Mgmt Plan to another location to give it more prominence (see p 42 and 39)</p> <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Text has been added to sections of the document to clarify the relationship between NPS and SFPUC, and to expand the description of the Watershed Management Plan and clarify distinction between “park lands” and NPS SF Watershed Easement areas.</li> <li>2. SFPUC have been contribution</li> </ol>	<p><b>Need to create text additions</b> PUC suggestd that we include in “CURRENT PLANS FOR OTHER PARK AREAS NOT MANAGED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE” but this contradicts their concern not to be called a park area. Maybe a new heading “for other areas not managed by NPS – along with State Park plans? See specific pages where SFPUC is concerned about “park lands”</p>	