

GOGA, MUWO, FOPO Foundation – Updated 9/27/2016 (FINAL RESPONSES)

CONSOLIDATED Comments on DRAFT Foundation Document–(i.e., the “E10 review”)

Addressed in the F7 Draft Document

#	Page #	Line # (or row)	Comment	Commenter	Team Response (DSC/PWR/GOGA)
<i>Comments from Park Staff (submitted by Brian Aviles 9/1/2016)</i>					
1	3	21	Hasn't the (b) (5) (b) (5) (b) (5) (b) (5) Depends on how (b) (5) Perhaps	AR	<p>Comment refers to this sentence in the “brief description” for GOGA:</p> <p>“In total, the park is made up of over 75,000 acres of land spread across 14 different sites, many of which are in urban San Francisco.”</p> <p>Park atlas indicates approximately 90,000 acres, without MUWO, but we’re not positive that is correct (includes offshore areas, etc.)</p> <p>Park Response: “over 80,000 acres of land spread across numerous different sites...” (GMP example for language) – majority of sites outside urban setting of SF -Want to include scale “over 80,000 acres spread across numerous park sites” – different character of sites from urban SF to Marin County - Scale is important; multiple sites (exact number is not as important</p> <p>Revisions made. Now reads, “In total, the park is made up of over 80,000 acres of land spread across numerous park sites, many of which are in urban San Francisco.”</p>
2	3	25	California State Parks need to be mentioned along side Parks Conservancy and Trust.	AR	<p>Again, part of the “brief description of park unit” for GOGA. Suggest to revise as:</p> <p>National Park Service staff achieve their mission through collaboration, cooperative relationships, and partnerships with other agencies and organizations, including the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy; California State Parks; Presidio Trust; and a variety of</p>

					<p>local, state, and federal agencies.</p> <p>Yes?</p> <p>Park Response: Yes, made change.</p>
3	3	29	I'm concerned about referring to Alcatraz as an attraction, and not sure about Ocean Beach as being "famous". I'm wondering if we might say "world renown sites such as Alcatraz and Crissy Field"	AR	<p>Suggest to revise as:</p> <p>The recreation area contains a stunning variety of cultural and natural features for visitors to enjoy, including world-renowned places such as Alcatraz Island and Crissy Field.</p> <p>Park Response: Accepted edit</p>
4	3	36,37	I'm not comfortable with the way the NPS role on the Presidio is described as coastal areas. Prefer the line "The Presidio Trust....coastal areas "be deleted – not needed here.	AR	<p>So it would read (please confirm):</p> <p>Situated at the northern tip of the San Francisco Peninsula, the Presidio has been part of Golden Gate National Recreation Area since 1994. For over 200 years, the Presidio area was used as a military base, first by Spain in the late 1700s, briefly by Mexico in the 1800s, and by the United States from 1846 onward. The Presidio Trust, established in 1996, now manages most of the lands within the Presidio, while the National Park Service manages the coastal areas.</p> <p>Park Response: Covered in Special Mandates, can delete sentence. -Suggest map to show management areas - Unigrid shows Presidio and GGNRA as separate. Important to show Crissy Field as NPS not Presidio.</p> <p>Made text changes. Will revisit maps during graphic layout.</p>
5	4	9	Is "the world" the right descriptor, or should it say "Bay Area"?	AR	<p>This is part of the "brief description of the park units" for MUWO.</p> <p>Suggest to revise as:</p> <p>Muir Woods National Monument is in Marin County, California, just a few miles north of San Francisco. The</p>

					<p>558-acre monument preserves one of the last remaining ancient redwood forests in the world Bay Area. Some of the redwoods are nearly 1,000 years old and reach heights of over 250 feet.</p> <p>Park Response: Accept “Bay Area” Change made.</p>
6	8	37	<p>It seems that one of FOPO’s FRVs is its unique vantage point to view and interpret the Golden Gate Bridge – and how it influenced the design of the bridge - are we missing the obvious here?</p>	AR	<p>Discuss: FRVs are usually resources/values that are managed by the park so wouldn’t suggest including a new FRV for the vantage point.</p> <p>Perhaps we could add language about the bridge and the park’s relationship to it as part of the FOPO park unit description?...or related FRV descriptions if necessary.</p> <p>Park Response: Seems strange to not mention bridge in document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bridge is permitted by NPS and built on army property with permit; when army moved from Presidio, DOI inherited permit for bridge - Park spends time reviewing bridge actions and permitting - Include bridge permitting and land relationship in FOPO special mandate? (Original army permit would have spanned two counties) <p>Brief Description: First line in first paragraph, revise to: Fort Point stands at the southern entrance to San Francisco Bay, in the very shadow of the Golden Gate Bridge. Built on the site....</p> <p>Second paragraph, last few sentences. Revise to: Today the fort is managed as a distinct park unit within the larger Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Due to its location, the park offers a unique vantage point to view and interpret the Golden Gate Bridge, including how the fort’s presence influenced the design of this landmark. Seasonally, the fort is open to the public for self-guided and ranger-led tours.</p>

					Changes made.
7	11	30	The special mandates section is confusing to me as to why these specific pieces of legislation were highlighted and not others? Specifically the PL 92-589 summary states we can only acquire by donation but in several recent cases we have acquired through purchase so I'm not sure that this piece hasn't been superceded.	AR	<p>Legislation included in the foundation special mandates section is drawn from the GMP. The Presidio Act was added after park comment.</p> <p>Special mandates related to MUWO and FOPO were not individually identified in GMP. FOPO legislation from DSC librarians only identifies establishing legislation from FOPO and GGRA.</p> <p>Park Response: Add sentence about none identified for FOPO; MUWO would be covered under GMP</p> <p>Follow-up: Greg Greff – PWR Lands, verified GOGA mandates language only applies to State lands and locally-owned lands. Would not prevent GOGA from acquiring private lands from a willing seller. Special mandate language updated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Law 92-589, the enabling legislation for Golden Gate National Recreation Area, authorizes the secretary of the interior to acquire lands, improvements, waters, or interests within the legislated boundary by donation, purchase, exchange, or transfer. The law specifies that “any lands or interests owned by the State of California, or any political subdivision thereof, may only be acquired by donation” (see appendix A).
8	11	30	Why is this section just for GGNRA and not Fort Point and Muir Woods – are there no special mandates?	AR	<p>See above</p> <p>FOPO was not part of GMP; language will be added to reflect no special mandates identified for FOPO</p> <p>Changes made.</p>
9	17	43-47	I'm concerned with the characterizations in this paragraph, “lumped” and “somewhat neglected” Suggest the following re-write of this paragraph:	AR	Suggested changes made to document. Note that this resolves some similar comments to follow.

			Fort Point National Historic Site was designated as a separate unit of the national park system, with an independent purpose and significance. The preservation challenge at Fort Point is substantial given the age of the fort, the intricacies and uniqueness of the construction, its size, and its exposure to coastal weather. Fort Point could also use improvements to the visitor experience, including updated exhibits. Additionally, sea level rise is also a considerable threat—waves have already been 2 documented coming over the access road during high-tide storm events.		
10			<p>very quick thoughts: double-check to see how Strategic Plan is referenced visitor data...should there be more on trends, context? include OneTam (significant collaboration!)</p> <p>Stinson...expand climate change/sea level rise focus if possible Fort Baker (did i just miss it?) direction for boundary adjustments, possible additions upcoming in-holdings off-shore relationship with NOAA marine sanctuaries and Coastal CA monument</p>	MM	<p>Strategic plan has been included in Appendix B- Selected list of recently completed plans under Program Implementation plans</p> <p>Park Response: Visitor data: Ok as is per BA.</p> <p>OneTam is park's collaboration with other agencies for land management (primarily MUWO)- this doesn't need to be called out individually since part of inclusive list from park description</p> <p>Stinson – site improvement plan on pg 27 includes plan for sea level rise; already covered</p> <p>Ft. Baker – waterfront site plan moved up to medium priority</p> <p>Boundary adjustments – part of lands acquisition plan</p> <p>NOAA as partner – included under partnerships in park description and does not need to be called out individually</p> <p>Golden Gate National Recreation Area Report to the Community 2014 (prepared by park business division) - referenced under program implementation plans of pg.</p>

					37
12			What happened to the second significance statement for FOPO – the one we revised to cite the strait? Think that should be here	BA	<p>No changes.</p> <p>Comment actually refers to the purpose statement, which in early August draft read,</p> <p><i>The purpose of Fort Point National Historic Site is to preserve and interpret Fort Point—one of the finest examples of Third System Civil War-era forts in the United States—and the immediately adjacent fortifications guarding the Golden Gate Strait at the entrance to San Francisco Bay.</i></p> <p>But then, we revised that purpose per the August 4 email from Brian, which reads (in part):</p> <p>“Colleagues,</p> <p>Aaron walked into my office with an edit to the Fort Point significance statement: ...and the immediately adjacent fortifications guarding the Golden Gate. (delete the revised ending: "...strait at the entrance to San Francisco Bay.")</p> <p>....</p> <p>Brian”</p> <p>(Note: the email refers to it as a significance statement, but it was the purpose.)</p> <p>On 8/1 and 8/4 calls we agreed to 2 sig. statements for FOPO:</p> <p>1) Topic = Military Architecture, Construction, Technology (which we had already)</p> <p>2) Topic = The Fort’s Strategic Location and Its Economic, Political, Social, and Environmental Influence</p> <p>3) Michele had initially suggested a third about FOPO’s place in the network of forts guarding SF Bay, but we</p>

					agreed not to include this statement.
					Park Response: Fine as is.
13	3	12-17	Should give the annual visitation figure here as it makes GGNRA largest attendance of any national park (not mentioned until page 15, line 36)	J Skibbe (Conservancy)	<p>The language we agreed upon for page 15, line 36 is, “approximately 17 to 20 million visitors annually”</p> <p>So this paragraph could read (please confirm):</p> <p>The founders of Golden Gate National Recreation Area, established in 1972, intended to bring national park experiences to urban populations. The park’s extensive collection of natural, historic, and scenic resources and diverse recreational opportunities fulfill the purpose of bringing “parks to the people”—particularly to the 7 million people who live in the San Francisco Bay Area. Today, however, the resources of Golden Gate National Recreation Area are nationally and internationally recognized as well, extending their value to all of the United States and beyond. <u>The national recreation area serves approximately 17 to 20 million visitors annually. OR Each year, millions of people visit Golden Gate National Recreation Area.</u></p> <p>Park Response: Go with broader “Each year, over 17 million people visit Golden Gate National Recreation Area.” Change made.</p>
14	11	28	Should there at least be a mention of the Golden Gate Bridge? Pretty important cultural icon of the park although not administered. Creates a destination that attracts millions of visitors with impacts on the park. Maybe mention their permitted area. (NOTE: this is somewhat mentioned page 12 line 19-25)	J Skibbe (Conservancy)	See comment 6.
15	General		Should there be a mention of long term support for the One Tam initiative partnership?	J Skibbe (Conservancy)	See comment 10
Comments from Jill Johnson, Historical Architect, CRMMD, GOGA (submitted by Jill 9/2/2016) <i>Jill notes: * Only cultural resource-related sections were skimmed.</i>					
16	5	44-45	Suggest replacing words continuum (because it	J Johnson	No changes.

			<p>refers to a linear series of things between two points and I don't think that's what is intended) and maybe doorstep with others word, such as variety or gateway (to).</p> <p>GGNR Significance Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational and Educational Opportunities. The continuum of park resources at the doorstep of the San Francisco Bay Area provides an abundance of recreational and educational opportunities. 		Significance statements for GOGA and MUWO taken from recent GMP. These represent approved language.
17	6	5	<p>Suggest dividing this sentence into two; i.e., ...prison. The island later housed...</p> <p>GGNR Significance Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alcatraz Island. Alcatraz Island, the site of pre-Civil War-era fortifications, was the nation's first military prison, which later became the most notorious maximum security penitentiary in the United States, and subsequently was the site of the occupation that helped ignite the movement for American Indian self-determination. 	JJohnson	<p>No changes.</p> <p>Significance statements for GOGA and MUWO taken from recent GMP. These represent approved language.</p>
18	6	12	<p>I think Ocean may not be the desired word. Suggest: Pacific Rim.</p> <p>GGNR Significance Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military Installations and Fortifications. The park includes one of the largest and most complete collections of military installations and fortifications in the United States, dating from Spanish settlement in 1776 through the 20th century. These installations have served as command posts for the U.S. Army in the western United States and the Pacific Ocean. This long period of military presence has yielded one of the most extensive collections 	JJohnson	<p>No changes.</p> <p>Significance statements for GOGA and MUWO taken from recent GMP. These represent approved language.</p>

			of historic architecture in the national park system.		
19	6	26-27	<p>Suggest: They contain...and retain historic and scientific values.</p> <p>GGNR Significance Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coast Miwok and Ohlone People. Park lands are within the traditional homelands of the Coast Miwok and Ohlone people. They comprise indigenous archeological sites of native heritage and historic and scientific values. 	JJohnson	No changes. Significance statements for GOGA and MUWO taken from recent GMP. These represent approved language.
20	6	29	<p>Can these (MUWO) significance statements be strengthened?</p> <p>MUWO Significance Statements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Muir Woods National Monument preserves the last remnant old-growth redwood forest in proximity to metropolitan San Francisco that retains its primeval character. 2. The establishment of the monument is an important demonstration of early 20th century American conservation history. 	JJohnson	No changes. Significance statements for GOGA and MUWO taken from recent GMP. These represent approved language.
21	17	9	Suggest rephrasing, eliminating the word “celebrate” and making this a bit more specific.	JJohnson	PWR Response: Language retained. This is in regards to the scope of the Crissy Field Refresh effort.
22	18	6	The phrasing may not invoke the desired intent. Suggest: ...but will focus on improvements that will preserve the historic structure and improve operations with minimal change in the appearance...	JJohnson	PWR Response: Comment addressed through revised language incorporated from comment #62.
23	19	23	Suggest: parking and traffic congestion	JJohnson	PWR Response: Kept original language, it’s broader than congestion.

24	21	26	Suggest including a commitment to seismic safety per the Executive Order Establishing a Federal Earthquake Risk Management Standard of February 2, 2016. In rehabilitating existing buildings, buildings will be seismically retrofitted in compliance with the International Building Code.	JJohnson	PWR Response: No change made. The Safety management plan (pg 21) is currently written as operational and how to adapt wellness and safety strategy for park. Law and policy would already be covered in park management and facilities consideration since required. Not necessary to include.
25	27	Data Needs	Suggest committing to seismic safety throughout the Park per the above-referenced Executive Order, not just on Alcatraz.	JJohnson	PWR Response: Park decision to keep as is (BA). This is law and policy that would apply to all park structures.
Comments from Offices of the Natural Resources Science and Stewardship Directorate (NRSS)					
26	18	47	(b) (5)	Eric Lord— Water Rights Branch	PWR Response: [Muir Woods / Redwood Creek Restoration Efforts] Suggest we adopt the second sentence. Language incorporated, but softened somewhat as water rights issues are largely downstream at Muir Beach, away from restoration efforts.
27	22	24-29	(b) (5)	Eric Lord— Water Rights Branch	PWR Response: [Tennessee Valley Restoration and Site Planning] This is a greater level of specificity than is typically provided in these planning need descriptions, but seems like it would be an important consideration for the park as they move forward on this planning effort. Incorporated into line 29.
28	21	6-24	(b) (5)	Eric Lord— Water Rights Branch	PWR Response: [Rancho Plan] Seems appropriate to add this consideration here. Team has incorporated language from the GMP regarding the important consideration of water rights in the context of considering any new facilities for the area.

29	25		I was glad to see the “Water resources availability studies” in the Planning or Data Needs table. Given California’s drought susceptibility and climate change, this will be very important. I would consider adding, as part of these studies, some contingency planning aspect.	Eric Lord— Water Rights Branch	PWR Response: Added to the notes for this planning need: “Could include contingency planning for times of drought.”
30	10	15	Interpretive Themes should include something about the primeval characteristics of the soundscape at MUWO, and the quiet zones in the park that so many visitors appreciate.	Ashley Pipkin, NSNSD	DSC Response: The one interpretive theme included in the foundation for MUWO comes directly from the recently approved GMP. Updated primary interpretive themes that are inclusive of all 3 units (i.e., not specific to each unit) from the 2014 LRIP are included in appendix B.
31	14	32	Objectives for Alcatraz ferry planning appear to be missing fuel efficiency or evaluation of carbon footprint of the overall operation.	Daniel George, IMD	PWR Response: This would be addressed through next ferry concession contract process. Additional language has been added to the last bullet under “scope” to capture this.
32	16	1	This approach to climate change adaptation, mitigation, and communication is quite robust, with the exception that there is little mention of climate change adaptation for terrestrial/inland resources (adaptation is only mentioned in the context of sea level rise). Suggest you revise the title of this plan to read simply “Climate Smart Adaptation Plan for Coastal and Other Areas”. Then in line 34, suggest you revise this paragraph as follows: “In addition to the pilot sea level rise projects, the park is committed to addressing climate change vulnerability and adaptation strategies for natural and cultural resources and assets inland from the coast. The park will participate in climate adaptation efforts with partner agencies....”	M. Wood, CCRP	PWR Response: We have removed the specific reference to Stinson Beach and Crissy Field. The park strategic plan sets broad goals/commitments to climate adaptation.
33	17	18-19	(b) (5)	EQD-Michael Edwards	PWR Response: Changes made per comment.
34	17	20	(b) (5)	EQD-Michael Edwards	PWR Response: Changes made per comment.

			(b) (5)		
35	17	30	Should "Counties" should be lowercase "counties"?	EQD-Michael Edwards	DSC Response: DSC editing standard has uppercase
36	17	32-34	(b) (5)	EQD-Michael Edwards	PWR Response: Change made per comment.
37	18	14	Parenthetical repeat of park unit names seems unnecessary. It is unclear what the intention is for the second list.	Daniel George, IMD	PWR Response: Agree. This is redundant. Will delete the names within the parentheses.
38	21	19	(b) (5)	EQD-Michael Edwards	PWR Response: Changed language to building a "sustainable" trail system.
39	21	21	(b) (5)	EQD-Michael Edwards	PWR Response: Revised scope to acknowledge that: <u>"The plan will follow guidance provided in the general management and dog management plan."</u> In regards to studies and evaluations. Language has been revised to denote that these studies are needed at a "finer scale."
40	23	6	Suggest revising the title in high priority planning needs table as "Climate smart adaptation plan for coastal and other areas"	M. Wood, CCRP	PWR Response: Revise per resolution of comment 32.
41	24	Natural Resources	MUWO will soon be getting data from a "Soundscape Inventory", if you want to list that on the needs it is currently in in the process.	Ashley Pipkin, NSNSD	PWR Response: Added as "medium" priority with a note that is underway.
42	24	Other Planning	Consider amending the "Scenic resources management plan" name to "Visual resource	ARD Jim Cheatham	PWR Response: Revised plan title as suggested and added more detail to the notes.

		Needs	management plan”. The ARD visual resource program uses the term visual resources to capture the idea that the inventory process we have developed can be used in historic/cultural landscapes as well as for scenic views. Consider in addition to current notes: “The plan would use the inventory information to develop goals, objectives and strategies for protecting the values characteristics of views and for historic/cultural views could be used to compliment cultural landscape inventories.”		
43	24	Other Data Needs	Consider additional data need under Natural Resources: Data Needs and Studies, called “Visual resources inventory”. Notes: “The inventory will identify the scenic quality and NPS/visitor values of scenic views and serve as the baseline for development of visual resources management plan.” Optional notes: “The inventory method allows for the inventory of an identified set of scenic view so would lend itself to the development of pilot projects or the inventory of specific areas of the park.”	ARD Jim Cheatham	PWR Response: Inventories are already referenced in the notes for visual resource management plan.
44	24	Other Planning and Data Needs	The Visual resource management plan and Visual resource inventory (as commented) are currently under the “Natural Resource” heading. These planning and data needs also support cultural resources/landscapes and visitor experience. Consider which resource they would support the most to confirm their best location.	ARD Jim Cheatham	PWR Response: Park chooses to keep under this topic area.
45	36		Suggest addition of the following to “Selected Plans and Data Collection Efforts”:	NRSS-GRD: Connors, Tim	DSC Response: Although the appendix is titled “Past and Ongoing Planning and Data Collection Efforts,” the underway/ongoing efforts table and existing/completed list only include planning documents. NRSS comments received during the E10 review suggest adding several data collection, monitoring, and inventory efforts to this appendix that do not seem to fit alongside the plans included in the current appendix. Options for edits: 1 – Keep the appendix the way it is and change the title

					<p>to “Past and Ongoing Park Planning Efforts” to better reflect what is included. In this case the NRSS suggested additions would not be added because they are data collection, not planning documents.</p> <p>2 – Add the suggested NRSS data collection efforts to the underway/ongoing table and existing/completed list as suggested in the E10 comments</p> <p>3- Add one row to the underway/ongoing table summarizing ongoing data collection efforts suggested by NRSS</p> <p>PWR Response: Suggest we go with OPTION 1 remove “data collection efforts” rather than add all of the NRSS efforts. These are very specific and my sense is that these will be referenced in the RSS.</p> <p>Park Response: Option 1 is fine. Change name of appendix. Made changes.</p>
46	36		NPS Geologic Resources Inventory Report: Port, R. 2016. Golden Gate National Recreation Area, including Fort Point National Historic Site and Muir Woods National Monument: Geologic Resources Inventory report. Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/GRD/NRR—2016/1266. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado	NRSS-GRD: Connors, Tim	See above
47	36		NPS Geologic Resource Inventory Map: 2009. Digital Geologic Map of Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Vicinity, California (NPS, GRD, GRI, GOGA, PORE, MUWO, FOPO, RORI, SAFR, GOGA digital map). NPS Geologic Resources Inventory Program. Lakewood, CO. https://irma.nps.gov/DataStore/Reference/Profile/1048292	NRSS-GRD: Connors, Tim	See above
48	36		NPS SFAN Paleontological Resources Inventory Report: Elder, W. P., T. Nyborg, J. P. Kenworthy, and V. L. Santucci. 2007. Paleontological Resource Inventory and Monitoring—San Francisco Bay Area	NRSS-GRD: Connors, Tim	See above

			Network. Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/NRPC/NRTR—2008/078. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.		
49	36		NPS GOGA Paleontological Resources Inventory: Henkel CJ and Others. 2015. Golden Gate National Recreation Area: Paleontological resource inventory. Natural Resource Report. NPS/GOGA/NRR—2015/915. National Park Service. Fort Collins, Colorado	NRSS-GRD: Connors, Tim	See above
50	36	Appendix C	<p>Consider including additional selected past and ongoing park planning and data collection efforts:</p> <p>Ongoing data collection: National Park Service, Air Resources Division. “Air Quality Conditions & Trends: Golden Gate NRA,” “Air Quality Conditions & Trends: Muir Woods NM,” “Air Quality Conditions & Trends: Fort Point NHS.” National Park Service. Denver, CO. http://www.nature.nps.gov/air/data/products/parks/index.cfm.</p> <p>Past data collection: Kohut R.J. 2004. Ozone risk assessment for San Francisco Bay Area Network. National Park Service. Fort Collins, Colorado. Available at: https://irma.nps.gov/App/Reference/DownloadDigitalFile?code=442226&file=sfanO3RiskOct04.pdf.</p> <p>NPSpecies, Information of Species in National Parks. “Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA)”, Muir Woods National Monument (MUWO)”, “Fort Point National Historic Site (FOPO)”. IRMA Portal version. National Park Service. Available at https://irma.nps.gov/NPSpecies/Reports/Systemwide/Ozone-Sensitive%20Species%20in%20a%20Park.</p> <p>Pardo, L.D., M.J. Robin-Abbott, C.T. Driscoll, eds.</p>	ARD Jim Cheatham	See above

			<p>2011. Assessment of nitrogen deposition effects and empirical critical loads of nitrogen for ecoregions of the United States. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-80. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. Available at: http://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/38109.</p> <p>Sullivan, T. J., McPherson, G. T., McDonnell, T. C., Mackey, S. D., Moore, D. 2011. Evaluation of the sensitivity of inventory and monitoring national parks to nutrient enrichment effects from atmospheric nitrogen deposition: San Francisco Bay Area Network (SFAN). Natural Resource Report NPS/NRPC/ARD/NRR—2011/325. National Park Service, Denver, Colorado. Available at https://irma.nps.gov/App/Reference/DownloadDigitalFile?code=425480&file=sfcn_n_sensitivity_2011-02.pdf.</p> <p>Sullivan, T. J., McDonnell, T. C., McPherson, G. T., Mackey, S. D., Moore, D. 2011. Evaluation of the sensitivity of inventory and monitoring national parks to acidification effects from atmospheric sulfur and nitrogen deposition: San Francisco Bay Area Network (SFAN). Natural Resource Report NPS/NRPC/ARD/NRR—2011/376. National Park Service, Denver, Colorado. Available at https://irma.nps.gov/App/Reference/DownloadDigitalFile?code=428455&file=sfan_acidification-eval_2011-05.pdf.</p> <p>US Geological Survey. Last modified February 20, 2015. "Predicted surface water methylmercury concentrations in National Park Service Inventory and Monitoring Program Parks". U.S. Geological Survey. Wisconsin Water Science Center, Middleton, WI. http://wi.water.usgs.gov/mercury/NPSHgMap</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			.html.		
Comments from Martha Crusius, Pacific West Region – Submitted 9/7/16					
51	3	13, 22, 28, 29, 33	Description goes back and forth between park and recreation area (1 st line paragraph 3). Are we okay with using both?	PWR, Martha Crusius	DSC Response: Language used in approved GMP. Park Response: confirmed use of both interchangeable terms.
52	4	8, 16	If acreage numbers are used (612, 298, 558) then the differences should be explained. Or just use current acreage number.	PWR, Martha Crusius	Made changes. After discussion, text now reads, In 1905, when William Kent and his wife Elizabeth Thacher Kent realized that Redwood Canyon, a popular hiking and recreation destination, contained one of the last uncut stands of old-growth redwoods in the San Francisco Bay Area, they purchased the land comprising the core of the forest and donated it to the U.S. government. President Theodore Roosevelt proclaimed the area Muir Woods National Monument in 1908. Today, the monument is home to...
53	5	48	Suggested change to title “Coastal Corridor <u>Ecosystems</u> ”	PWR, Martha Crusius	DSC Response: Significance statement titles are not used in most foundations. This title was used in GMP. Park Response: no change
54	6	19	Question use of “truly” unique	PWR, Martha Crusius	DSC Response: Significance statement has been revised through E6 and E10 process and rooted in GMP language. Park Response: Subjective; no change
55	6	33	Suggest changing “metropolitan San Francisco” to “a major metropolitan area”	PWR, Martha Crusius	DSC Response Significance statement language from GMP. Retain approved language.
56	9	37-43	Scenic Beauty FRV – Mentions Bay area community. What about visitors?	PWR, Martha Crusius	DSC Response – Interpretive themes are approved language from GMP. Updated themes from the LRIP are included as an appendix.
57	14-15	36-45/1-8	Alcatraz Ferry Embarkation Plan Scope. Do we need the bulleted details given that this plan is already underway?	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response-- Park preference to keep detailed bullets.
58	16	11-19	Climate Smart Adaptation Plan – Bullets about increasing sea level impacts. Suggest pulling the	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – accept change

			bullets up into a paragraph. Reduce space needed and keep more focus on the actions.		
59	17	17	Add “(Underway)” to the title	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – accept change
60	17	17	The dog management plan has been underway forever seems like focusing more on implementation strategies here would make sense.	PWR, Martha Crusius	It will continue to be underway after foundation document is completed. Park preference to keep current scope.
61	17	46	Do we want to say “somewhat neglected”?	PWR, Martha Crusius	Addressed per Aaron language (see comment #9)
62	18	4-6	Scope: Suggested edit: The Fort Point improvements strategy will address preservation, operations, and maintenance to improve resource protection and visitor experience. This effort will not, without fundamentally changing the use or footprint of the area, but rather will focus on minor improvements.	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – accepted change.
63	18	15-16	Why are the park names repeated? Suggested edit: To date, over 400 waysides and kiosks dot the landscape. Four distinct websites for the Presidio, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Muir Woods National Monument, Fort Point National Historic Site, and Alcatraz Island (Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Muir Woods National Monument, Fort Point National Historic Site, and Alcatraz) are updated and maintained.	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – accepted change. Several other comments noted this redundancy.
64	18	17-18	What does this mean “several hundred print media in multiple languages?” Archival?	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – removed “collections” to clarify this is not achival material.
65	18	20	Delete the word “hard”	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – accept change
66	19	1	Delete second reference to “construction” – after “vehicular bridge.”		PWR Response – accept change
67	19	24	Suggest including “and” after conditions.	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – accept change
68	19	47	Where it says “all private vehicles”. Do we mean to say from “all legal parking spaces?”	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – check with GOGA
70	20	13, 15	Consistent verb tense. Change “helps” to “would help”. Change. Also – suggest: In implementing transportation management efforts at Muir Woods, the National Park Service would continue to conduct <u>analyze</u> of	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Suggested Response – accept change

			visitor use patterns.		
71	20	30	Add “Update” after Park Asset Management Plan	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – accept change
72	23	15	Delete “(Data Need)”	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – accept change
73	24-25	24-25	This looks like part of the Social Science Data Strategy description.	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – move this sentence to after the planning/data needs tables
74	23	Row 8, Column 2	Delete “check plan”?	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – change made
75	24	3 rd table, 10 th Row, last column	What is “SOD”	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response – change made “sudden oak death”
76	25	11 th Row, last column	What is “five incoming coast guard” mean. Clarify	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Response –Change to “for the five incoming lighthouses from the coast guard”
77	25	20 th Row, last two columns	Are the Education and Interpretive program plans parkwide? The notes say site specific as needed.	PWR, Martha Crusius	PWR Suggested Response – Suggest we clarify as “Site-specific <u>for the various park units</u> as needed?”
78	29	19	Is Howard’s title really “Director” others are “Chief”	PWR, Martha Crusius	No change. Confirmed with park. Retain position title as is—“Director of Communications and Partnerships”
79	15	38	GOGA has recently completed a new Climate Change Action Plan in 2016. Perhaps change tense from “would apply” to “applies”. See https://www.nps.gov/goga/learn/nature/upload/2016-Climate-Change-Action-Plan-1.pdf	GOGA, Castellini, Laura	Thank you, Laura. We removed this from the high priority plans and updated Appendix C to reflect the recently updated plan (2016).
80	15	42/43	Same comment about tense, plus remove referHence to 2012. The original plan was 2008 and the updated one is 2016.	GOGA, Castellini, Laura	Change not applicable since plan was moved to Appendix C with other recently completed plans.
81	15	29	The title should include Adaptation, per the three actions in the above Action Plan	GOGA, Castellini, Laura	Change not applicable since plan was moved to Appendix C with other recently completed plans.