

PWRO DRAFT GMP 5-2010 – PART II

| NO. | INITIAL | SECT. | PAGE | LINE | COMMENT | RESPONSE/ NOTES |
|-----|---------|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. | DAH | 8 Table 22 | 342 | | Marine Protected Areas – The marine and estuarine area of Golden Gate National Recreation Area was named a Federal Marine Protected Area under the National System of Marine Protected Areas on May 25, 2010. | |
| 2. | DAH | 8 Table 22 | 349 | | Soundscape. I think we should discuss with the Natural Sounds Program (b) (5) . Desired conditions are included in the zoning descriptions so that may be enough. We are initiating our ATMP process this fall so this is critical timing. | |
| 3. | DAH | 8 | 362-363 Figure s on 364-365 | 38-44 and 1-31 | <p>CRITICAL COMMENT. 13-20 ft of sea level rise over the next 100 years is the extreme estimate based on melting of the Greenland ice sheet. (b) (5)</p> <p>The most commonly used figure for planning in our area at present is the 1.4 m (55 inches) from the Pacific Institute report shown in the figure on page 365 (no figure #).</p> <p>In addition, we do not think the USGS (b) (5)</p> <p>the figure does illustrate where the most vulnerable areas might be. Suggest updating this section with the recent Pacific Institute report predictions based on Noah Knowles work. Sorry I can't re-write this section for you right now.</p> <p>The figures on pages 364-365 have NO relationship to the 13-20 ft prediction by Overpeck!</p> | |
| 4. | DAH | 8 | 370 | 24-27 | The Marin Headlands drain into Rodeo Lagoon, the Pacific Ocean and San Francisco Bay. | |
| 5. | DAH | 8 | 374 | Table 3 | Richardson Bay is not within GGNRA although it does receive a small of amount of waters from the park. | |
| 6. | DAH | 8 | 375 | 26-28 | GGNRA overlaps with Gulf of the Farallones and Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuaries, it is not just adjacent to them. Our boundary is ¼ mi. offshore in many areas, and theirs is at one of the high tide lines (not sure which). | |
| 7. | DAH | 8 | 376 | 12 | Same comment as above. The subtidal zone does not abut the sanctuaries but overlaps with some exceptions (Point Bonita to Pacific and inside the Golden Gate strait and SF Bay are outside the sanctuaries). | |
| 8. | DAH | 8 | 378 | 4-6 | GGNRA waters (and our State Lands lease) overlap with GFNMS and MBNMS in Tomales Bay, and from Stinson Beach to Point Bonita. It will overlap with MBNMS if we add marine waters in San Mateo County south of Pacifica. Our legislative boundary (but not state lands lease) also overlaps at Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. | |
| 9. | DAH | 8 | 385 | Veg Comm unity Map | The Marine Sanctuary boundaries are in the legend but don't show up on the map. | |
| 10. | DAH | 8 | 395 | 12-30 | California Brown Pelican has been delisted. Newly listed species found in the park = Black Abalone. Critical Habitat for Green Sturgeon and Proposed Critical Habitat for the Leatherback Turtle include park waters. | |
| 11. | DAH | 8 | 414 | 21-22 | There are no longer federal species of management concern (SOMC). I'm not sure where this came from – an old Resource Management Plan, or from GPRA goals related to species of management concern which has no connection to federal species of management concern (b) (5) | |
| 12. | DAH | 8 | 414 | 35 | What reference is Hall 2009? Seems like a secondary reference for all this stuff but maybe ok. | |
| 13. | DAH | 8 | 416 | 27 | Coho salmon Central California ESU is Evolutionarily Significant Unit, not Ecosystem Studies Unit | |
| 14. | DAH | 9 | 562 | 16-18 | Park facilities at Stinson Beach and Muir Beach would affect floodplain function at Easkoot Creek and Redwood Creek, not Rodeo Creek. | |
| 15. | DAH | 9 | 563 | 35-43 | <p>I think the extent of restoration (b) (5) .</p> <p>At Easkoot there would be opportunities to remove non-native vegetation and expand riparian habitat but major creek channel work is not contemplated. At Rancho, there are opportunities for extensive removal of invasive vegetation and restoration of riparian habitat. We would like to do much more but much of the creek channel and water rights will still be on the ag parcels and impacted by equestrian facilities. However, we would explore partnership opportunities to do more extensive creek restoration with a desire to reconnect steelhead habitat with the ocean. Check with Brian and Nancy on this, including which creeks at Rancho have the best options for restoration. Not sure we would be able to reconnect floodplains or create more natural watercourses or re-create the natural hydrologic regime given the amount of water already used for other purposes. We would do all that we can and there would definitely be long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial, and localized impacts.</p> <p>I think removal of facilities in Lower Tennessee Valley, restoration of riparian habitat, improvement to hydrologic function, and removal of the dam at Tennessee Pond are a much more significant improvement than that proposed at Stinson. This should be highlighted as well.</p> | |
| 16. | DAH | 9 | 569 | 41-43 | Where are we proposing to remove 30 acres of European beach grass? The only place I can think of with this much is Ocean Beach and we have no intention of removing it there. Also at Phleger our proposed restoration efforts there are quite modest and would not be characterized as restoration of a large tract of second-generation redwood forest. We are removing some old roads and social trails that have led to increased sedimentation in the creek, and we will do some exotic plant removal and possibly other creek restoration actions. | |
| 17. | DAH | 9 | 570 | 40 | See additional file with text edits. Boating would be restricted for all boats, not just motorized boats. Use same language found under Alt 3 on page 574 lines 41-42. | |
| 18. | DAH | 9 | 570 | 44 | CRITICAL COMMENT. See additional file for text edits. Change impacts of Alt 1 to wildlife on Alcatraz to moderate to major, adverse, regional impacts to waterbirds on the island. We definitely believe this could have impacts to regional / SF Bay populations of some species, not just park-specific. | |

| PWRO DRAFT GMP 5-2010 – PART II | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|-------|------|----------|---|-----------------|
| NO. | INITIAL | SECT. | PAGE | LINE | COMMENT | RESPONSE/ NOTES |
| 19. | DAH | 9 | 571 | 20 | CRITICAL COMMENT. See additional file for text edits. Change impacts of Alt 1 to wildlife on Alcatraz to moderate to major, adverse, regional impacts to waterbirds on the island. We definitely believe this could have impacts to regional / SF Bay populations of some species, not just park-specific. The other file also has some thoughts on impairment and how it would be avoided. | |
| 20. | DAH | 9 | 572 | 34 | I think Cultural Resources objected to the term that these buildings would be managed ‘as ruins’ | |
| 21. | DAH | 9 | 574 | 33 | I didn’t think Alt 3 included removal of the rubble piles. | |
| 22. | DAH | 9 | 574 | 37-45 | See separate text edits to this section. Emphasis should not be on protecting gull habitat but protecting colonial nesting waterbirds from human-induced disturbance including predation by gulls as a result of disturbance. | |
| 23. | DAH | 9 | 575 | 1-2 | CRITICAL COMMENT. Change impact level to moderate to major, adverse, regional impacts to waterbirds. This alternative could affect the size of the SF Bay and/or Central California coast breeding populations of some colonial nesting species. | |
| 24. | DAH | 9 | 575 | 16 | CRITICAL COMMENT. Change impact level to moderate to major, adverse, regional impacts to waterbirds. This alternative could affect the size of the SF Bay and/or Central California coast breeding populations of some colonial nesting species. See separate text edits for thoughts on impairment. | |
| 25. | DAH | 9 | 577 | 16-27 | Brown pelican has been de-listed. | |
| 26. | DAH | 9 | 579 | 44 | Change Stinson Gulch area to Bolinas Lagoon watershed. | |
| 27. | DAH | 9 | 580 | 8-9 | The park is not currently pursuing any actions to reduce barred owl use and nesting to reduce adverse impacts to spotted owls, though we have considered it. | |
| 28. | DAH | 9 | 580 | 19-33 | Need to mention that the restoration actions at Fort Funston would benefit Lessingia if a new population is introduced to Fort Funston as proposed in the applicable recovery plan (which has a long name I can’t recall at the moment). Lessingia does not currently occur at Fort Funston and may not have been there historically either, though suitable habitat could be restored there. | |
| 29. | DAH | 9 | 580 | 45-47 | CRITICAL COMMENT. The City of San Francisco has been doing shoreline stabilization in the vicinity of the bank swallow colony, both on and off NPS property. The City is planning additional actions in the future. These actions have potential for long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts to the bank swallow. Since this is the only population in the region (next closes colony is on the San Mateo/Santa Cruz county line at Ano Nuevo) so I think this would have to be considered regional impacts, not local. | |
| 30. | DAH | 9 | 582 | Table 16 | CRITICAL COMMENT. Change No Action impact determination for Bank Swallow to minor to moderate, adverse, and regional. | |
| 31. | DAH | 9 | 582 | 14-17 | The removal of infrastructure, the dam at Tennessee Pond (which supports bullfrogs) and restoration of riparian habitat in Lower Tennessee Valley would also benefit Calif. Red-legged frog. | |
| 32. | DAH | 9 | 583 | 21-24 | Brown pelican has been de-listed. | |
| 33. | DAH | 9 | 584 | 21-23 | It is not expected that Spotted Owls would benefit from creek restoration at Stinson Beach. Delete this. ESA determination would be same as no-action. | |
| 34. | DAH | 9 | 584 | 36-39 | CRITICAL COMMENT. See comments 29 and 30 above. Same statements would apply to Alt 1. | |
| 35. | DAH | 9 | 585 | Table 17 | CRITICAL COMMENT. Change No Action impact determination for Bank Swallow to minor to moderate, adverse, and regional. | |
| 36. | DAH | 9 | 587 | 17-20 | Brown pelican has been de-listed. | |
| 37. | DAH | 9 | 588 | 17-20 | It is not expected that Spotted Owls would benefit from creek restoration at Stinson Beach. Delete this. ESA determination would be same as no-action. | |
| 38. | DAH | 9 | 588 | 34-37 | CRITICAL COMMENT. The City of San Francisco has been doing shoreline stabilization in the vicinity of the bank swallow colony, both on and off NPS property. The City is planning additional actions in the future. These actions have potential for long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts to the bank swallow. Since this is the only population in the region (next closes colony is on the San Mateo/Santa Cruz county line at Ano Nuevo) so I think this would have to be considered regional impacts, not local. | |
| 39. | DAH | 9 | 590 | Table 18 | CRITICAL COMMENT. Change No Action impact determination for Bank Swallow to minor to moderate, adverse, and regional. | |
| 40. | DAH | 9 | 591 | 25-28 | Brown pelican has been de-listed. | |
| 41. | DAH | 9 | 592 | 36-39 | CRITICAL COMMENT. The City of San Francisco has been doing shoreline stabilization in the vicinity of the bank swallow colony, both on and off NPS property. The City is planning additional actions in the future. These actions have potential for long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts to the bank swallow. Since this is the only population in the region (next closes colony is on the San Mateo/Santa Cruz county line at Ano Nuevo) so I think this would have to be considered regional impacts, not local. | |
| 42. | DAH | 9 | 594 | Table 19 | CRITICAL COMMENT. Change No Action impact determination for Bank Swallow to minor to moderate, adverse, and regional. | |