

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</b>			
36540 36553	The Sensitive Resource Zone around Bonita Cove and Bird Island has been changed in the Preferred Alternative to extend 300 ft. out from the shoreline, rather than to the park boundary at ¼ mile. The Sensitive Resource Zone description related to Visitor Experience has been clarified and further limits visitor activities that would be allowed within this zone, to better meet the intention of this zoning designation. In general, boating and visitor access would be restricted or prohibited, particularly during the most sensitive times of the year. Zoning restrictions would not apply during actual emergency situations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative 3 Preferred Alternative map Sensitive Resource Zone in Marin County at Bonita Cove and Bird Island needs to be changed to 300 ft.</li> <li>• Sensitive Resource Zone description for Visitor Experience needs to be re-written to further restrict public access in this zone.</li> <li>• The preferred alt text on V.1 p. 209 is fine, as is the summary of alts Table 17. All other text looks ok.</li> </ul>	X Discuss visitor use in sensitive resource zone.
36505 36499 (54)	The zoning map for San Francisco of the Preferred Alternative has been modified to show the offshore portion of the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area as a Sensitive Resource Zone. The terrestrial portion of the Wildlife Protection Area is not part of this plan and was addressed in the General Management Plan Update for the Presidio and the Crissy Field Environmental Assessment.	<p>V.1 p. 184 Correct table to year round closure to boats 300 ft. off of Alcatraz to match language on p. 170.</p> <p>Add Sensitive Resource Zone to the offshore portion of the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area to the Preferred Alternative map for San Francisco.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensitive Resource Zone description for</li> </ul>	

	<p>Table 10: Comparison of Alternatives for Alcatraz Island has been corrected to match the description of the preferred alternative related to the Sensitive Resource Zone in the Offshore Bay Environment section, which states that this zone would be demarcated by warning buoys and closed to boats year round. Details of enforcement of the closure would be worked out when the Sensitive Resource Zone is established.</p> <p>The Sensitive Resource Zone description related to Visitor Experience has been clarified and further limits visitor activities that would be allowed within this zone, to better meet the intention of this zoning designation. In general, visitor access would be restricted or prohibited, particularly during the most sensitive times of the year. The portion of Ocean Beach inhabited by the federally threatened western snowy plover is heavily used by the public and designating this area as a Sensitive Resource Zone would be incompatible with visitor use in the preferred alternative. Designating this area as a Natural Zone allows visitor use to be managed to preserve resources and could involve controlled access.</p> <p>The nearshore/offshore rocks and sea stacks in San Francisco are dispersed over a broad area and contain lower concentrations of dispersed sensitive resources than the Sensitive Resource Zones identified in the Preferred Alternative. Designation of areas as Sensitive Resource Zones in the plan has been reserved for areas that are highly sensitive to a variety of activities and warrant highly controlled access.</p>	<p>Visitor Experience needs to be re-written to further restrict public access in this zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Proposed Boundary Adjustment map on V.1 page 113 needs to be updated to include proposed zoning that would be applied once the boundary adjustments are enacted and we have acquired the state lands lease.</li> <li>• Edits need to be made to the Offshore Ocean Environment, San Mateo County on p. 103-104. We also need to determine the precise location of the southern terminus of the ocean boundary so as to not include Maverick's. Current text is confusing and has some slightly inaccurate statements. This section also requires better justification for the marine boundary expansion in San Mateo per discussion with PWR and NPS Ocean and Coastal Resources office (Jeff Cross).</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>We have updated the map of Proposed Boundary Adjustments to show the proposed zoning that would be applied to the offshore waters in San Mateo County, including a Sensitive Resource Zone corresponding to the Egg Rock to Devil’s Slide Special Closure. The proposed zoning would be evaluated at the time the boundary adjustments are enacted and the state lands lease is acquired.</p>		
36501 (55)	<p>See #3 Birds at Alcatraz in the Comment Response Worksheet for how to address this comment which is related to increased visitor access on the island and breeding areas that are opened to the public in the preferred alt.</p> <p>All of Alcatraz Island is a National Historic Landmark and since Alternative 3 is about Focusing on National Treasures, designating a Sensitive Resource Zone to protect natural resources on the island was incompatible with this alternative. However, all of the zones would protect native wildlife and wildlife habitat to the greatest extent possible. With the exception of the Parade Ground, the majority of the bird breeding habitat within the Evolved Cultural Landscape zone will be closed to the public during nesting season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider adding some text to the description of the preferred alternative on V.1 page 168 re. the MAIN PRISON AREA that builds some of the mitigation measures into the alt description.</li> </ul>	
36565	<p>Some changes were made to Alternative 1 in response to scoping comments to enhance the level of restoration in this alternative. This included the removal of all facilities and restoration of wetland and riparian habitat in lower Tennessee Valley resulting in increased beneficial impacts to water quality. If climate change results in unforeseen changes in resource conditions during the life of the GMP, the park would consider additional restoration actions at that time, including those identified in Alternative 2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	

Not a concern statement		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Headers on V.1 p. 180-184 do not match the Alcatraz alternatives table on these pages.</li> </ul>	
36510	<p>The Bolinas Lagoon Restoration Project – Recommendations for Restoration and Management (GFNMS 2008) identified key actions to protect and restore Bolinas Lagoon and its watershed. Three tables identify recommendations for restoration in the Locally Preferred Plan, recommendations for management (Best Management Practices), and recommendations for recommendations for adaptive management and monitoring. Each action identifies the key land managers, including GGNRA, with a vested interest in implementation of each action. GGNRA involvement would be required to implement restoration actions in portions of the watershed, including improving floodplain function along Easkoot Creek, at the Bolinas Y, and along the east shore of Bolinas Lagoon (e.g. Stinson Gulch), and improving transitional habitat and habitat connectivity along the east shore of the Lagoon.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add language in previous column to each alternative description for the Stinson Beach north to Bolinas-Fairfax Road on V.1 pages 204, 235 and 255.</li> <li>• Also need to add to references and determine correct citation.</li> </ul>	<p>Edited this response on Thursday.</p>
36502	<p>The Preferred Alternative has been changed in the mainland area west of Highway 1 at Devil’s Slide to adopt the Sensitive Resource Zone identified in Alternative 2 (if these lands are acquired) to provide an increased level of protection for nesting seabird colonies on Devil’s Slide Rock and the adjacent mainland.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to send an email to Dave Holland, San Mateo County Parks, about whether Sensitive Resource Zone would be compatible with their planning for the trail along Hwy 1 when its abandoned.</li> <li>• Need to clarify land ownership in this area.</li> <li>• Change Alternative 1 Map of San Mateo County to match zoning on the Alternative 2 Map in this area.</li> <li>• Add the text from V. 1 Alt 2 p. 243 for the Sensitive Resource Zone (Devil’s Slide Area – mainland west of Highway 1) to</li> </ul>	<p>X Column M in the Public Comment Matrix stated that the decision was about the Offshore Area, while these particular comments were actually about the mainland west of Hwy 1. Zoning of the marine waters</p>

		<p>Alt 1 on page 218 under Pedro Point, Devil's Slide and San Pedro Mountain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We could add to the environmental analysis about beneficial effects associated with this zoning.</li> </ul>	<p>was addressed under 36505 above.</p>
36458	Add text to GMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, we should add information about nesting seabirds at Bird Rock, Devil's Slide and San Pedro Rock (are there marine mammals here as well?) to the affected environment and environmental consequences section. All three of these rocks are part of the California Coastal National Monument (add reference to this as well). FWS can provide additional info for the affected environment. The designation of waters around Bird Rock and Devil's Slide as Sensitive Resource Zones would have beneficial effects by limiting public access close to the seabird breeding colonies. San Pedro Rock would be surrounded by Scenic Corridor Zone and receive less protection but would be consistent with the Marine Protected Area designations by the State. San Pedro Rock may have fewer sensitive resources.</li> </ul>	<p><b>TO BE WRITTEN</b></p>
36476	<p>This comment from NOAA refers to the Foundation Statement for Alcatraz Island. The fundamental resources and values are those that directly contribute to the significance for which the park was established. Alcatraz Island is designated a National Historic Landmark for its significance as the site of pre-Civil war fortifications, the nation's first military prison, the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No text changes needed, just a response to the comment.</li> </ul>	<p>Concern Statement was not an accurate representation of the question.</p>

	<p>maximum security prison, and the American Indian occupation. The Island's highly significant natural resources are included under the Coastal Corridor Foundation Statement. The Coastal Corridor statement is general in nature because the park's enabling legislation does not mention specific natural resources and the Alcatraz water bird colonies were not present when the park was established.</p>		
36536 (154)	<p>Text in V. III Implementation Planning, subsection Natural Resources has been edited to address this comment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Edit text on V. 3 p.39 to read "the Gulf of the Farallones and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries plan"</li> </ul>	<p>The concern statement misrepresented the comment. NOAA is only asking for a text edit, among many other specific text edits that need to be captured.</p>
36533 (156)	<p>NPS and USGS observations and video monitoring of black-crowned night-heron nests indicate that their eggs and chicks??? are a primary food source for common ravens on Alcatraz Island. The presence of ravens may be more directly related to the presence of water bird nesting colonies than to the high numbers of visitors on the island. The park maintains a depredation permit for common ravens from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and would continue to manage common ravens under all alternatives. In addition, food service and picnicking and would be highly managed under all alternatives, with refuse collection and removal from the island occurring daily. The park would also continue to monitor for non-native pest species on the island to prevent their introduction and establishment. Human disturbance may also result in increased nest predation by ravens.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>V. 2 P. 244, 1<sup>st</sup> long para. Add text to the middle of the really long paragraph, just before the sentence that starts 'The Model Industries...' add "The National Park Service would continue to manage the common raven population on Alcatraz. The park would also continue monitoring to ensure non-native pests such as rats do not become established on the Island. Human disturbance may also result in increased nest predation by ravens. The park would continue to manage visitation and park operations to minimize disturbance to nesting birds."</li> </ul>	<p><b>Confirm this response with Bill Merkle.</b></p> <p><b>p. 7 of the GGAS letter re. cumulative impacts- does this response address their comment???</b></p>

	<p>The park would continue to manage visitation and park operations to minimize disturbance to nesting birds.</p> <p>Text has been added to the Potential Environmental Consequences for Alternative 3, the NPS Preferred Alternative for Alcatraz Island to clarify that the park would continue to monitor and manage common ravens, and non-native pest species on the Island. In addition, visitation and park operations would continue to be managed to minimize disturbance.</p>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• V. 1 Page 167, 2<sup>nd</sup> para. Strike the word 'historic' before buoys in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence.</li> </ul>	
36562 (163)	<p>The Implementation Planning section of the GMP describes the subsequent studies, planning and compliance that would be conducted prior to implementation of specific actions in the plan. These include fulfilling the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, National Historic Preservation Act, and other relevant laws and policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	
36573 (164)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	Alison to write response
36560 (168)	<p>Thank you for your comments requesting more detailed information on threatened and endangered species in the park, including population size, suitable habitat areas, actions that would be taken to protect the species, specific impacts to species from the alternatives, and mitigation measures that would be taken to protect species. We believe that the GMP and EIS include the appropriate level of detail for a programmatic document. All of the management zones in the GMP (V. I) provide for protection of threatened and endangered species. Mitigative measures for natural resources and threatened and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are not recommending text changes in response to these comments.</li> </ul>	

	<p>endangered species are identified in V. III, including best management practices and conservation measures. More detailed conservation measures would be developed in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and NOAA-National Marine Fisheries Service during implementation planning for actions in the GMP.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments with respect to the lack of evaluation of impacts on habitats and non-threatened and endangered species, including migratory birds that may be declining. The Affected Environment Section of the EIS describes the diversity of habitats and migratory birds found within the park. The Potential Environmental Consequences section of the document addresses potential impacts of the alternatives to these habitats and associated wildlife in the section entitled Natural Resources – Biological Resources, Habitat (Vegetation and Wildlife). Because of the programmatic nature of the GMP and EIS, analysis of potential impacts is also at a programmatic level. Mitigative measures for natural resources are identified in V. III, including best management practices. More detailed environmental analysis and mitigative measures would be developed during implementation planning for actions in the GMP.</p>		
<p>36597 (184) 36625 (14)</p>	<p>The management zoning and descriptions of the alternatives in the GMP acknowledge the potential for conflict between public access and adjacent sensitive habitats throughout the park, and were developed in a manner that provides for abundant public access while also protecting sensitive habitats.</p> <p>U.S. Coast Guard boats and personnel would continue</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No text changes proposed.</li> </ul>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do we want/need to add any caveats to the USCG access through restricted areas with respect to sensitivity of resources or just</p>

	have access through restricted areas within GGNRA in the performance of their duties.		continue to work with them to minimize the impacts of their activities? Need to add response re. requesting assistance from USCG in closed areas or did Nancy or Brain address?
36579 (186) (And 36560???) Addressed above)	The National Park Service does not agree with Marin Audubon Society's conclusions that the information and analyses in the DEIS are vague and insufficient to support the preferred alternative. While the management zones would allow for certain types of uses and development within them, the description of the alternatives limits the uses and development to restricted areas within the zones. The DEIS includes mitigative measures to protect resources. The Implementation Planning section commits the park to additional planning and environmental analysis before specific actions are implemented.	•	Marin Audubon Society comments may need to be looked at in totality and pulled into one consolidated response that addresses their overarching concerns. This response is crafted to address these broader comments rather than specifics of habitat fragmentation, potential for exotic species, how sustainable trails would reduce erosion, etc.
36627 (187)	Spotted and barred owl monitoring and management	• No text changes.	

	are part of the park's ongoing wildlife management program and are not specifically addressed in the GMP.		
36590 (188)	The analysis of impacts to Habitat (Vegetation and Wildlife) for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 has been changed to document that Alternative 2 has greater beneficial impacts than Alternative 1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 20. Change Potential Key Impacts to Habitat in Alt 1 to long-term, <b>minor</b>, <b>beneficial</b>, localized impacts...</li> <li>• Table 20. Change Potential Key Impacts to Habitat in Alt 2 to long-term, <b>moderate</b>, <b>beneficial</b>, <b>parkwide</b> impacts...</li> <li>• P. 240, p.242 same text changes in 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of conclusions.</li> </ul>	<b>X discuss</b>
36626 (189)	<p><b>The Preferred Alternative includes dune enhancement at Stinson Beach. Detailed site planning would occur in the future. The park may take more immediate actions as needed in the interim.</b></p> <p>Bird Island is included in the Sensitive Resource Zone in Alternative 2. See the map of Alternative 2 for Marin County. The text for Alternative 2 Offshore Ocean and Bay Environments has been modified to add reference to Bird Island.</p>	<p>Add text on page 239 to the Offshore Ocean and Bay Environment, Sensitive Resource Zone header: Sensitive Resource Zone (offshore areas around Muir Beach and Point Bonita – from Bird Island to Point Bonita Cove)</p>	<p><b>X discuss</b></p> <p>The Bird Rock/Island question about Alt 2 should be a separate concern statement as the other questions in this concern statement relate to Stinson Beach.</p>
36576 (201)		•	
36578 (203)		•	
36373 (11)	We acknowledge that San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's role in making consistency determinations with the San Francisco Bay Plan. Text has been added to the Coastal Zone Management Act Consistency section in V. III to clarify the role of BCDC and that a consistency determination will be required prior to implementation of actions in the GMP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text on p. 70 needs to add BCDC role, and need for consistency determination to implement actions in the plan. (I couldn't find any place under Implementation Planning that this should be added.)</li> </ul>	Nancy and Brian need to write the text responses re. BCDC, Cal Trans and FEMA.

	FEMA Cal Trans  NOAA		
36547		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NOAA letter needs to be reviewed item by item for what to include and not. They have specific suggested text edits.</li> </ul>	Daphne will take the lead on this.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensitive Resource Zone description needs to be rewritten.</li> </ul>	Daphne, Brian, Nancy and I will work on this.
		•	
		•	
		•	
		•	
		•	
		•	