

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.
Equestrian			
36550	Same response as #36516, group these concerns and have one response.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider noting the potential park horse patrol location change from the lower valley to the diverse opportunities zone in the summary table on page 280. 	X (may not need entire group)
	TOPIC: Cost Estimates or Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
36517 (34)	<p>The park lands in San Mateo County are important and large parts of the park, and it is understandable to question why a smaller portion of the project cost estimates are devoted to this geographic area. Throughout the park lands, the GMP focuses effort on addressing historic preservation, facility rehabilitation, and natural resource restoration needed within the park, with very little new construction. Historic preservation costs at Alcatraz Island and in Marin County park lands are particularly high because of the number and size of historic structures at these locations.</p> <p>The equestrian programs at Rancho Corral de Tierra provide excellent opportunities for many visitors to enjoy park lands, and therefore, we believe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<p>X Question for Brian and Nancy to resolve: Revisit how we characterize essential/priority capital costs vs. desirable/lower priority. Do we want to change the wording? "Essential" does not seem to describe the intent.</p>

	expenditures are justified in this area.		
Row 65, XXXXX	The cost estimates for removal of facilities in Lower Tennessee Valley were grouped with costs for natural resource restoration for Marin County park lands; however this has been changed to clarify that the estimated costs of facility removal at Tennessee Valley were included in the GMP. A row was added to the cost estimate tables for alternatives 1 and 2 in facility removal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add underlined text to cost table row on vol. I, page 226 “Marin County sites, including Stinson Beach, <u>Tennessee Valley</u>”, change cost to \$1,710,000 • TBD: page 227 Add row above “Capehart housing: remove...” Add this: “Lower Tennessee Valley: remove roads and nonhistoric structures”, add in cost column: \$250,000 • Alternative 2, page 248; NR Restoration, Marin County Sites, cost should be : \$13,400,000. Facility Removal, Facilities at various park sites, costs should be: \$2,580,000 	
	TOPIC: Maintain Facilities instead of Building New Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
36525	<p>Maintenance is an ongoing need for park facilities. The GMP includes information regarding large scale facility rehabilitation and historic preservation projects, but does not include details about year-to-year maintenance priorities. Projected schedules for maintaining facilities are captured in the Park Asset Management Plan (PAMP), which uses a number of Park Service-wide criteria to identify maintenance priorities.</p> <p>NPS Management Policies 2006 on park facilities and design principles would guide building design. Management Policies require that designs for facilities are “harmonious with and integrated into the park environment.”</p> <p>The park contains a large number of facilities, not all which support the park’s mission. The GMP planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we want to make this suggestion by NOAA? Vol I, page 120, add this sentence after 1st sentence in first bullet: “Do not allow for new construction in areas that are subject to changing environmental conditions. 	<p>X Ask Daphne about NOAA edit</p> <p>X Ask Brian about facilities at Ft Funston and Ocean Beach (drinking and restroom)</p> <p>X Editing – do we use “preferred alt” in final? Or “the plan proposes”</p>

	<p>team examined those facilities, and considered them for disposal. The goals and strategies may be found in the GMP section titled Facilities Not Directly Related to the Park Mission.</p> <p>The preferred alternative includes very few new facilities. The vast majority of recommendations are for historic preservation and facility rehabilitation. The cost estimates for new facilities are far outweighed by estimates for historic preservation and facility rehabilitation.</p> <p>Management Policies 2006 also guides where and if facilities would be rebuilt if destroyed due to natural hazards, and the policy states that new or rebuilt facilities should not be located in areas where they would be damaged or destroyed by natural physical processes. (Sarah's note: may delete this paragraph, and remove this reference also from the concern statement. This refers only to an edit NOAA suggested)</p> <p>Link this response with other facilities comments 36482 and 36611.</p>		
36482	<p>Group response to this concern with 36525</p> <p>One of goals of alternative 1 is to enhance access to and within park lands and make them welcoming places to visit, which is consistent with providing visitor amenities. At Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, the preferred alternative calls for improved visitor amenities, including parking, restrooms, trails, and other items. The preferred alternative recommends replacement of Stinson Beach facilities with sustainable new facilities which would replace deteriorated restrooms, showers, picnic areas, and parking lots.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	

	Descriptions may be found in the alternatives section of the GMP.		
36611	<p>Group response to this concern with 36525.</p> <p>Trail improvements at Fort Funston are part of the preferred alternative and could include the Sunset Trail.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider text change: page 214 vol I to include naming the Sunset Trail and describing connecting it to regional trails (Lake Merced, etc) (Nancy may have written text) 	
	TOPIC: Dog Walking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
	<p>NPS received many public comments on the GMP addressing dogwalking within GGNRA. Due to the controversy and litigation surrounding dogwalking, the need to address dog management coming a number of years prior to the start of the GMP, and the site specific details needed to adequately describe the implementation of a dogwalking plan at twenty-two distinct areas, GGNRA initiated a planning effort focusing solely on dog management, separate and distinct from the GMP. Because the GMP covers many of the same geographic areas as the dog management plan, and thus has considered many if not all of the same resources and values present at those locations, its proposed zoning is broadly consistent with the dog management plan. However, the GMP and dog management plan are separate and distinct planning documents; if there are inconsistencies, the final dog management plan would amend the GMP for this particular use. GGNRA encourages those individuals who have submitted comments to the GMP regarding dogwalking and associated environmental consequences to re-submit those comments, if applicable and not already submitted to the draft Dog Plan/EIS, to the supplemental dog management plan/EIS anticipated for public review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	

	and comment in late summer 2012.		
36528 36524		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Downsize the facility to include parking, shuttle stop, some interpretation.	