

Comment ID #	Comment Source	Comment (Direct quotations from comment submissions)
62	P	It is important to replace the trees that are being removed, especially Eucalyptus. Trees capture the carbon still being released after all of the efforts of carbon reduction. During winter they intercept rain through their leaves, branches, trunks and roots thereby purifying the water that goes into local streams, the Bay, ocean and ultimately the rain that falls back to earth. Their roots stabilize the earth reducing mud slides. For nearly 20 years Marin ReLeaf has been planting acorns without the benefit of irrigation. There are successful oak trees throughout Marin as a result. These trees are reestablishing native flora and fauna where before the ground was fallow. We challenge the park service to rehabilitate its lands with native trees in a similar manner as Marin ReLeaf and other organizations around the Bay Area.
78	P	Consider developing a small-scale educational nursery/restoration center focused on restoration of native plant communities, wildlife, and restoration science in general (for the watershed and elsewhere in Golden Gate).
80	P	1.) Throughout the park I believe alternative number 2 is most important. I looked through all the alternatives in all the different areas and agree with this alternative the most. Global climate change and overall degradation of our natural ecosystems is a serious issue and I think Golden Gate National Recreation Area needs to take a more proactive approach to protecting their natural resources. The protection and interpretation of rare plants at the Marin Headlands, the amazing redwoods at Muir Woods, the threatened Snowy Plover on ocean beach, and the awesome seabirds on Alcatraz are all very important to me and I believe if we educate visitors and residents more about the amazing ecology of this area they will appreciate them more and want to protect them too.
85	P	I enjoy wildlife and the ecosystems that ensure that their will be healthy, diverse range of wildlife for years to come. Please choose Alternative 2 when making your selection.
86	P	In addition, I feel strongly, that all!!!!!!!!!!!!dogs should be kept on leash in all!!!!!!!!!!!!areas of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Please, decide on the side of Nature, and people who enjoy same.
87	C	None of your plans are a priority in California. With the economy in such a disastrous state, everything is becoming more expensive, why should any of the dollars be used for any change to the parks? Stop any of your grandiose plans.

89	P	<p>I support Alternative 2 with the inclusion of a plan to allow a few areas to be designated for high volume, high impact human recreational, to channel those folks away from sensitive habitats that need appreciation from afar. Preserving and Enjoying Coastal Ecosystems for the sites listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> " Alcatraz Island " San Francisco, which includes Upper Fort Mason, China Beach, Lands End, Fort Miley, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, and offshore marine areas " SFPUC Water shed Easements in San Mateo County " Mori Point in San Mateo (this area is adjacent to Sharp Park which is owned by San Francisco and habitat for the San Francisco Garter Snake and Red Legged Frog)
89	P	<p>I support Park Plans that allow natural habitat to continue uninterrupted by human interference with protects for this such a effective fence barriers and educational materials.</p>
89	P	<p>Protective barriers need to be used to prevent visitors from harming the environment they came to see. Dogs must be on leash. Wild life must not be exposed to human food or trash. Current habitat protection measures have not been enough.</p>
90	P	<p>Alternative 2 for Alcatraz Island, all San Francisco locations in San Francisco County, the SFPUC and Mori Point in San Mateo County is by far the most well conceived of the alternatives that will enhance citizens quality of life in the Bay Area by preserving habitat for native wildlife for the enjoyment of future generations.</p>
90	P	<p>The GGNRA must fulfill their responsibility of protecting threatened and endangered species by all means available. In particular, protecting and enhancing habitat for endangered species such as the Western Snowy Plover must take precedent over human and pet recreational use. Extinction is forever. Protection can not simply be limited to where a listed species breeds. All aspects of these species including feeding and resting areas must be considered. Environmentalist for the most part don't want to force the hand of the NPS by filing federal lawsuits that could ultimately close areas to all public use but unless the GGNRA takes existing laws seriously by protecting these species this is what will happen. Wildlife Protection Areas are a good start but if all they are is a sign without any active educational outreach and enforcement they are useless and even hypocritical. Let's not let what has happened in other areas of the U.S. to happen here. If area closures are brought about by lawsuits and judge's rulings it will be the fault of the existing stewards for not managing these areas properly.</p>
90	P	<p>Feeding of wildlife either purposefully or by proxy such as feral cat food stations, inappropriate trash receptacles, etc. must not be allowed and overt enforcement of existing rules needs to be facilitated. Not fun, I know but this is included in your responsibilities through the public charter.</p>

90	P	Education is key but it must be backed up with enforcement of existing regulations. The continuing stance of GGNRA officials looking the other way while a small minority of misguided citizens wreak havoc on our marginalized natural resources must end. Thank you for the great restoration work you have done in areas like the Land's End and for your considerations of my comments. I anxiously await your determinations.
92	P	1. Regarding the General Management Plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Muir Woods National Monument, I support Alternative 2 for Alcatraz Island, San Francisco county, the SFPUC and Mori Point in San Mateo County. Please preserve remaining habitat for birds and wildlife.
92	P	2. Enlist the public in support of volunteer clean-up days of sensitive habitat for birds and wildlife. Cite violators for leaving food waste and trash within the GGNRA. Ensure the health of the wildlife and birds. Clean up habitat on Alcatraz Island and preserve the Fort Mason community garden.
92	C	My main concern is to see horses and horse facilities remaining in existence on the coast, as they exist today. They are part of coastal culture and ambience and should not be made to disappear, they can only contribute to the richness of the land and its fortune used as pool lands.
93	C	Best option #1: Connecting people to parks in all areas.
99	P	As we enter our senior years, we think back often to our years of backpacking and hiking in our priceless national lands--lands that belong to all of us. Now we hate to think that just one administration can ruin these values for future generations. That's why we are endorsing the campaign by groups interested in protecting wilderness values for all Americans, not just those who can profit from it or those who exploit the land that belongs to all of us. We lived for 20 years in San Francisco and ran and hiked in the GGNRTA lands almost daily and often visited Muir Woods. We now visit less often, but we are fiercely protective of the area for vehicle-free recreation and wildlife habitat. We support the positions of the Audubon Society and other natural-use organizations
99	P	1. We support Alternative 2 for Alcatraz Island, all San Francisco locations in San Francisco County, the SFPUC, and Mori Point in San Mateo County to preserve habitat for birds and other native wildlife for future generations.
99	P	3. All choices should put natural values first. Vehicles should be SEVERELY limited (even for us geezers).
101	P	1. Generally speaking this document is terrific. Our only hesitation is that there should be community representation in this process from the beginning, not just comment at the end. 2. Only elements really missed are do to the insularity of the process within NPS/GGNRA.

102	P	<p>The wildfires raging around California this year dramatize the danger inherent in the current drought conditions and the build up of vegetation on public lands in Marin. The GGNRA is responsible for thousands of acres of open space along the Marin and San Mateo coasts. In particular, many of the acres in Marin County have become overgrown with chaparral since they came part of the GGNRA and grazing was eliminated. An area of particular concern is the steep hillside above Bolinas Lagoon. A fire in the brush on that hillside would threaten the village of Stinson Beach and could ignite vegetation on the Marin Municipal Water District land and/or Mt. Tamalpais State Park, thereby threatening the towns in East Marin. Nevertheless, the draft GMP/EIS does not address the need, or the tools to be used, to manage vegetation in the wild lands adjacent to homes, villages and other public lands. This is an oversight that surely should be addressed in a revised set of alternatives.</p>
102	P	<p>The East Bay Regional Park system has taken a leadership role in working with other public land managers in the East Bay to develop environmentally sensitive and culturally appropriate grazing plans to cost effectively manage vegetation that would otherwise pose a threat to communities there. There is an opportunity for the GGNRA to take a similar role in the North Bay: both the Point Reyes National Seashore, which manages the GGNRA's Northern District, and the Marin Municipal Water District, which adjoins a lot of GGNRA land, are in the process of developing new general management plans.</p> <p>The National Park Service has a reputation for being prejudiced against grazing. Unfortunately, that prejudice is reflected in the GGNRA's "2008 Endangered Species Big Year" materials. Grazing is included as a threat facing (a) the California Red-Legged Frog (<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>), (b) the Marin Dwarf-Flax (<i>Hesperolinon congestum</i>) and (c) the Tiburon Paintbrush (<i>Castilleja affinis</i> ssp. <i>neglecta</i>). This is contrary to conclusions in a 2004 "Response to [Point Reyes National Seashore] General Management Concepts," submitted by the Marin Agricultural Land Trust, and the Marin County Director of the U.C. Cooperative Extension.</p>
102	P	<p>The MALT/County Response to the PRNS Concepts suggests that these three federally threatened and endangered species can co-exist with grazing, or may even benefit from the disturbances caused by grazing. In each instance, the Response cites Park Service and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service studies. The MALT/County Response recommends a holistic concept to land management, one that "include[s] ranching and farming for the purposes of preserving cultural and historic values, producing food, and helping to maintain grassland biodiversity and threatened and endangered plant populations."</p>

102	P	<p>Dr. Robert Curry, director of the Watershed Institute at the California State University system, has studied the Point Reyes Peninsula and Bolinas Lagoon systems since 1963. In a March 21, 2001 Land Management Report Dr Curry commented on the benefits of continuing grazing on parklands:</p> <p>"Termination of grazing can lead to the loss of grassland habitat and its displacement by dense chaparral such as coyote brush (<i>Baccharis pilularis</i>). This unnatural succession leads to a significant loss in species diversity, particularly among birds and flowering plants. Plant succession studies conducted by Professor Joe R. McBride of the University of California at Berkeley's School of Forestry and Conservation and by wildlife biologists at the East Bay Regional Park District confirm that light grazing is the best means by which to maintain grassland habitat in California coastal valleys. These studies show that grazing maintains habitat for many animal species including golden eagles; burrowing owls; birds such as red-tailed hawks; buntings; meadow and horned larks; Brewer's, rusty and red-winged blackbirds; loggershead shrikes; kit foxes; garter snakes; tiger salamanders; and ground squirrels (which provide prey for many other species).</p>
102	P	<p>"Dense chaparral also poses a significant hazard of wildfires that burn much hotter and longer than grassland fires, resulting in a greater incidence of hydrophobic soils and resulting sheet erosion and waterway sedimentation. Fire-induced erosion of the steep hillsides above Bolinas Lagoon could cause severe siltation of the lagoon and its tributary streams, smothering the benthic plants and animals on which numerous bird species rely for food. [A link to the full report is available on the www.marinwatch.org archive page.]"</p> <p>It is time for good science to replace old prejudices.</p>
102	P	<p>It is time for the GGNRA to consider restoring ranching/farming to some of the lands in Marin, as is being done in Cuyahoga Valley National Park. It would be wonderful if the Banducci Ranch, could be returned to active agricultural uses. Perhaps in addition to cattle, the Banduccis could raise and manage goats, which could graze the scrub that has grown up on nearby land and constitutes a significant fire hazard. This could provide an opportunity for urban children to see farm animals as part of a family economic unit devoted to stewardship of their land. It could contribute to an understanding of food production in an age when childhood obesity is of national concern.</p>
102	P	<p>Your staff and the planners from Denver have been very effective in making the planning process accessible. For this reason, I'm sorry to raise these issues at this stage. However, it took the drought and fire threat to cause me to focus on the GGNRA's vegetation management problem and to research what other public land managers are doing to deal with it. Given the seriousness of the problem, and the life of a General Management Plan, I concluded that I must raise them.</p>
103	P	<p>Maintain a continuous boundary expansions mindset especially for lands adjacent to current parklands.</p>

103	P	Utilize the Organic Act narrative to acquaint park users with the general purpose of national parks. Possibly having it posted in various kiosks, and interpretive bulletin boards sites!?
109	P	The plan should indicate that management decisions pertaining to the area will be based on actual, scientifically valid, data indicating the benefits conferred to the environment and/or visiting public that would be expected to result from specific changes. Vague assumptions about environmental benefit or harm could be inaccurate and result in potentially damaging management policies.
109	P	The plan should indicate that volunteers needed for "habitat restoration and community stewardship" are anticipated to come from the current user community; GGNRA should commit to developing partnerships with the user community for consideration of land management decisions. The vast majority of visitors to the area originate from the immediately local communities, as well as the greater Bay Area including San Francisco. These users and their interests should not be excluded, as they are a knowledgeable and enthusiastic resource that is unlikely to be replaced by national and international visitors.
109	P	The plan should express GGNRA's commitment to working in partnership with the other government agencies, i.e. State and County Park Services, to coordinate development of portal areas and facilities such as trails, picnic sites, and campsites.
116	P	Alternative 1 seems to be the better aligned to the original principles however even that is flawed as it 1) Recreational access, including off leash dog walking, can co-exist with natural resource preservation, but the management zones in this GMP assume there can be no shared use of resources. This attitude must change. 2) You have not fully identified, or seem to have omitted all the recreational uses in all the areas in question - not just Fort Funston. 3) The General Management Plan says that the "Park Purpose" is: "to offer national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population while preserving and interpreting the park's outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values." This is simply not true. The legislation that created the GGNRA in 1972 makes it clear that the purpose for the creation of the GGNRA was: "the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment and planning." I urge you to embrace what the original intent was and to ensure that the future of the GGNRA is inline with the sentiments of providing recreational uses to the citizens of San Francisco.
122	P	2. An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is important because a diverse element of the population regularly come with their dogs to enjoy the park and would not otherwise use the area. Many sites were deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.

122	P	All the alternatives/concepts are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. As a conservation biologist, and also a hiker and dog owner, I recognize that we must be careful about what areas should be conserved and what areas should be used to ensure people have regular positive contact with nature. It's not a good use of conservation dollars/energy to try to maintain this area as "pristine" which as been so fundamentally changed by humans. Better to encourage people to connect to nature close to them, so that they will continue to value its protection in general.
123	P	Topic 1: Alternative 1 -- Connecting People with the Parks -- comes the closest to upholding the reason the GGNRA was created: "to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment and planning." However, none of the Alternative Management Concepts proposed are acceptable as stated, since all place too little emphasis on recreational uses and recreational access to sites within the GGNRA.
123	P	Topic 2: An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is important because this activity provides exercise for people as well as the dogs. Dog walking is enjoyed by a diversity of park visitors in the GGNRA, unlike most National Park activities, where poor people and people of color are severely underrepresented. Sites were deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.
123	P	Topic 3: All the alternatives are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources. All of our local beaches were ceded to GGNRA. This space is the necessary breathing room our crowded city needs.
124	P	Please do not allow Golden Gate Recreation area to be taken over by those who will ban any area that has off leash dog access to the ocean. We in San Francisco regularly take our dogs that love water to these beaches. To deny us access would be awful. My husband and I regularly take our three dogs to the beach. PLEASE keep it as it is for us.
125	P	I support Alternative 2 for Alcatraz Island, all San Francisco locations in San Francisco County, the SFPUC and Mori Point in San Mateo County to preserve habitat for birds and other native wildlife for future generations.
125	P	Wildlife should not be fed human food or have access to human food or trash within the GGNRA.
129	P	Why are you even thinking of eliminating off-leash dog-walking in these rare permitted areas of a city of over 800,000? These sites were deeded to the GGNRA specifically and only with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.
130	P	I. I am a supporter of Alternative 2 for Alcatraz Island, all San Francisco locations in San Francisco County, the SFPUC and Mori Point in San Mateo County to preserve habitat for birds, and other native wildlife.
130	P	All building should be green and eco-friendly for wildlife and human visitors.

130	P	2. I am not a resident of San Francisco, but I am a visitor and birder at the GGNRA. It is a treasure for us who live here and for the tourists.
130	P	Consideration must be given to making habitats for migrating birds safe and supportive for the birds. And don't forget our shorebirds and their welfare and habitat.
130	P	Make changes that care and support our birds and wildlife, not ones that will do damage. Do your best for us and future generations.
131	P	<p>Several of our members attended the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Open House in Sausalito on June 10th and we have reviewed the three alternatives outlined in the Spring 2008 Newsletter. We have the following comments for your consideration.</p> <p>We are a group of citizens who consider ourselves active environmentalists. Our members include individuals who have: solar panels on our roofs, drive 'hybrids', tithe to environmental non-profits, promote recycling, commute on public transit, work to ban chemical pesticides in our communities, and advocate the use of goats (as opposed to chemicals and/or mowing and/or controlled burning) to reduce the danger of wild-fire in our open spaces. We, also, live with dogs. We do not find these two characteristics (environmentalist and human with a dog) to be in conflict. Our dogs are our companions.</p>
131	P	We agree with the need to develop a long-range plan to protect our beautiful, sensitive environment while maintaining the founding reasoning behind the GGNRA: to provide open space recreation for the large urban population living nearby and to those visiting this urban area from other parts of the United States. We hope that the National Park Service has not forgotten the reason that this wonderful group of lands was preserved for all of us.
131	P	<p>Regarding the three Management Concepts, the same fundamental goals are included in all three of the Concepts/Alternatives; the difference we see is in the emphasis of the goals. We whole heartedly support Concept #1: Connecting People with the Parks, "Park management would focus on ways to attract and welcome people, connect people with the resources, and promote understanding, enjoyment, preservation and health." This Concept emphasizes the NPS management commitment to the founding idea of the GGNRA, ie "parks to the people."</p> <p>We realize that the final General Management Plan will contain elements from all three Alternative Management Concepts; however, whenever there are conflicts among the three, we urge you to give primary consideration to Concept #1: Connecting People with the Parks.</p>

131	P	<p>We long for the day we can legally walk with our dogs on-leash from our homes in Sausalito up the Morning Sun trail or across the Spencer Avenue overpass onto Alta Fire Road, over to Bobcat Trail and down to the Miwok Trail and on to Rodeo Beach for years. It is a beautiful route through an old eucalyptus grove, across the ridge-top and then down the Gerbode Valley, through the old farmstead, then along the creek and the lagoon and finally to the beach. From Alta Fire Road we could also continue onto the trail-head in Marin City and then home via sidewalks.</p> <p>Some of us live in Mill Valley and walk on-leash with our dogs up County View Road or Marin Drive, and then onto the Miwok Trail, then across Highway Route 1 and continue on into Tamalpais State Park, or from the Miwok Trail to the Coyote Ridge Trail then onto the Coastal Fire Road to the Coastal Trail, and from there to either Muir Beach or to Rodeo Beach. We want to continue to do so with the blessing of the NPS.</p>
131	P	<p>Some of us gain access to the Park by walking in from Marin City on Alta Fire Road. This is currently the most used area in the GGNRA in Marin for off-leash use. The community bordering this entrance includes a large apartment complex that is noted for being dog friendly. Of the 198 units, 80% include at least one dog. There are people, dogs and bicycles aplenty here, and have been for many years. The land surrounding Alta looks none the worse for wear from all of this on-road activity.</p> <p>All of the routes referenced above consist of fire roads; these are not narrow trails, they are wide (10 to 14 feet) roads. We share these fire roads with other hikers, and bicyclists, and equestrians. There is seldom any conflict, not with each other, nor with the wildlife through which we pass.</p>
131	P	<p>As a group of conservationists, we all take seriously the negative effects of auto use on our environment. When possible we prefer to stay out of our cars. Our interest is in walking into the park-lands that border our communities. We hope that the NPS will support us in our efforts to conserve, and will provide us access with our dogs into the GGNRA from the communities that are the Park's neighbors. Many of our members are of the "boomer generation". The older we get, and the more congested and troubled urban areas get, the more many of us rely on having our dog with us. They are on-leash, they don't chase or harass wildlife or humans or other dogs, they are our companions and walk next to us.</p> <p>We ask that the NPS remember the founding guidelines of the GGNRA, and that the new General Management Plan includes access into the GGNRA in Marin for those of us wanting to walk in with our dogs on-leash.</p>

133	P	1. Concept 2, Preserving and Enjoying Coastal Ecosystems, is the only concept which is consistent with the stated Park Purpose and the enabling legislation of the GGNRA. This is so because this alternative uniquely provides for "national park experiences" to people in an urban-impacted area while "preserving and interpreting the park's outstanding natural" and other values.
133	P	However, even within this concept there are several flaws in the preservation mandate. There is no mention of most of the 33 endangered species that are considered present in the GGNRA. Additional habitat areas for the mission blue butterfly, for example, should be declared sensitive and protected under all alternatives in Marin and San Mateo Counties. Similarly, on Alcatraz not enough of the grounds of the island are designated sensitive habitat to ensure the large number of breeding birds on the island can survive.
133	P	Concept 1, Connecting People with the Parks, should not be adopted under any circumstances. The concept would lead to the potential loss of the national caliber of the park from overuse and destruction of park values.
133	P	2. The Park should consider management of neighboring areas within the legislative boundary of the park, including Sharp Park. Contiguous restoration and trail connectivity would benefit from additional acquisition in these areas. The GMP must consider these opportunities, as they will arise in the planning horizon of the GMP.
133	P	3. Leash laws must be enforced throughout the GGNRA.
134	P	1. It is important to provide access to the park to all people/ residents. We all should be granted the privilege to enjoy the park.
134	P	2. WE NEED TO KEEP/ OR ASSIGN DESIGNATED OFF LEASH AREAS FOR DOGS TO BE EXERCISED, SOCIALIZED, AND FOR THEM TO ENJOY AS WELL. KEEP THE AREA OFF LEASH FOR DOGS! THERE IS NO OTHER PLACE WE CAN BRING OUR DOGS LIKE THE GGNRA IN THE BAY AREA OR IN SAN FRANCISCO.
136	P	Topic 1: I prefer Alternative 1/Concept 1: Connecting People with Parks, which has a goal of "bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population," and enhancing access, rather than making the park less accessible.
136	P	Topic 2: An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is important because&(state your favorite reasons, e.g. review the list of Sally Stephens' post and here are a few of mine.) --dog walking is currently enjoyed by thousands of park visitors. --dog walking is enjoyed by a diversity of park visitors in the GGNRA (unlike most National Park activities, where poor people and people of color are severely underrepresented) . --many sites were deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.

136	P	Topic 3:All the alternatives/ concepts are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources.
138	P	Topic 1: I prefer Alternative 1/Concept 1: Connecting People with Parks, which has a goal of "bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population," and enhancing access, rather than making the park less accessible.
138	P	Topic 2: An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is important because dog walking is currently enjoyed by thousands of park visitors and many sites were deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.
138	P	Topic 3:All the alternatives/ concepts are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources.
139	P	Topic 2: An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is important because -- --dog walking is currently enjoyed by thousands of park visitors. --dog walking is enjoyed by a diversity of park visitors in the GGNRA (unlike most National Park activities, where poor people and people of color are severely underrepresented). --many sites were deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.
139	P	Topic 3:All the alternatives/concepts are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources.
140	P	I support Alternative 2 for Alcatraz Island, all San Francisco locations in San Francisco County, the SFPUC and Mori Point in San Mateo County to preserve habitat for birds and other native wildlife. Many species are reaching a critically low population or abundance as a result of habitat loss or degradation. It is imperative to preserve what they (we) have left.
140	P	Some bird species such as pigeons, crows, ravens and some gulls have developed large populations outside their normal ranges due in large part to availability of human waste and feeding by humans. Some of them now prey on threatened and endangered bird species.

140	P	I have observed people dumping canned beans, bread, and other food wastes from their cars and campers at Ocean Beach parking areas. Signage needs to be improved to stop this practice.
142	P	Alternative 1 -- Connecting People with the Parks -- comes the closest to upholding the reason the GGNRA was created: "to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment and planning." However, none of the Alternative Management Concepts proposed are acceptable as stated, since all place too little emphasis on recreational uses and recreational access to sites within the GGNRA.
142	P	Allowing large spaces for dogs to run free is essential in maintaining the health and positive socialization of our community's dogs. An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This activity provides exercise for people as well as dogs. Dog walking is enjoyed by a diversity of park visitors in the GGNRA, unlike most National Park activities. Sites were deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.
142	P	All the alternatives are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources. All of our local beaches were ceded to GGNRA. This space is the necessary breathing room our crowded city needs.
143	P	1. I prefer Alternative 1/Concept 1: Connecting People with Parks, which has a goal of "bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population," and enhancing access, rather than making the park less accessible.
143	P	2. An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is important because dog walking is currently enjoyed by thousands in the GGRNA and provides a valuable social gathering activity for these people.
143	P	3. There is not enough emphasis on balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is important and should be preserved. It can co-exist with protection of natural resources.
144	P	2. An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is especially important at Fort Funston where off-leash activity is the most common use. The park can often be cold, windy and otherwise unattractive to tourists and even people from the community. Dog walking is enjoyed by a diversity of park visitors (unlike most National Park activities, where poor people and people of color are severely underrepresented). There is a steadfast and dedicated group of people who walk their dogs, exercise their bodies and socialize at Fort Funston. Isn't that what parks are supposed to foster? Fort Funston was deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated. To ban off-leash dog walking would be a serious breach of the intent and wishes of the people.
148	P	All the alternative/concepts are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources.

149	P	<p>Topic 2: An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is important for many reason, some of which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --dog walking is currently enjoyed by thousands of park visitors. --dog walking is enjoyed by a diversity of park visitors in the GGNRA --many sites were deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated. --being a dog owner, I do not use national parks such as Stinson beach because dogs cannot be off-leash. I would like my tax dollars that are allocated for national park funding to provide me with resources that are relevant to me.
149	P	All the alternatives/ concepts are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources.
149	P	I think that that the GGNRA should stay as is. The area is the only place in SF where one can enjoy quality off leash time with their pets. Changing it to a National Park will cause too many restrictions
152	P	keep large areas of beach open for off-leash for dogs. we all need places where dogs and people can be free to run and play.
153	P	1) Alternative 1/Concept 1: Connecting People with Parks. I believe in the importance of healthy outdoor recreation and making the park accessible to the broadest array of visitors.
153	P	2) Off leash dog walking is important for the health and socialization of our beloved pets. Our dog walkers are surrogate parents to our pets and enjoy the emotional and physical health benefits to off leash walking. And dog walking is enjoyed by a diverse group of park visitors.
157	P	1. I strongly prefer Alternative 1 (Connecting People with Parks). I agree with the stated goal of "bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population," and I think it's critical to enhance access, rather than making the park less accessible. What's the point of creating natural areas within the parks if no one can enjoy them?
160	P	Topic 1) None of the concepts are acceptable as there is far too little emphasis on RECREATIONAL ACCESS/USES within the GGNRA. At least Alt.1 suggests bringing national park experiences to a large and DIVERSE URBAN POPULATION and enhancing access rather than making the lands less accessible to us residents.
160	P	Topic 2) An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of OFF-LEASH DOG WALKING. This is important because a diverse element of the urban population regularly come with families and family dogs to enjoy the park and beaches and would not otherwise use these areas. As you well know, many of these sites were deeded to the GGNRA in the Enabling Legislation with the understanding that the existing recreation uses, such as dog walking, would not be altered or eliminated.

160	P	<p>Topic 3) All the alternatives are too heavily biased toward conservation or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. The stated current conditions at individual GGNRA sites are not correct, and current recreation uses are not accurately represented: for example off-leash dog walking is only mentioned under current conditions at Fort Funston. We need a more accurate description of current recreational uses at ALL sites. Recreation within the GGNRA whether it be surfing, horseback riding, mountain biking, fishing, hang-gliding or dog walking are hugely important forms of exercise and these activities should be preserved as they can easily co-exist with protection of natural resources.</p>
162	P	<p>3. In my opinion, all the alternatives so far put forward over-emphasize conservation and under-emphasize recreation. Especially in the current climate of expensive transportation and increasing poverty and lack of resources, the expansion of such important recreational spaces should be preserved over creating more gardens of, for instance, native plants that are permanently fenced off leaving less and less space for hiking, exploring, and generally getting closer to nature.</p>
163	P	<p>My name is Laurie Wilson, and I have been a resident of Mill Valley, Marin County, California for over 20 years. I am a weekly user of GGNRA, whether running trails, riding my road and off-road bicycles, and riding my horse out the Muir Beach stable. I am writing today, from an equestrian perspective, as I have kept a horse at Muir Beach for over 4 years, and am a member of Ocean Riders. Let me first begin my saying that I love our stable. It is a place stuck in time, with its rustic old buildings, and a slice of "Old California" that anyone who grew up here misses. My young son LOVES to come out with me to the stable, on his once a week trip, and run all over before going on a short loop on our horse Mojito. I have even ridden the horse threw GGNRA up and over the hill to his pre-school, for a horse visit for all the children at his school. (Kumara School, Marin Avenue, Mill Valley) They loved it. Over the years, many of his friends have been introduced to horse, when they have joined us for a ride at the stable. As for myself, I so enjoy riding through peaceful Green Gulch, on my way up Middle Green Gulch trail, and then on to various parts of Tennessee Valley. I hope that you will please find a way to preserve horse riding facilities in Southern Marin. I understand your desire to bring as much land back to "nature", but in my opinion ours is a simple stable that fits in so well with a drive down Highway #One. It has become part of the landscape, as much a the Night Heron in the wetlands nearby. I believe that attempting to move it further up the Valley, would be the death of our beloved stable. I hope that you will consider the "People and Parks" version of your choices, that you are considering.</p>

164	P	<p>1. The most important ideas to include in the preferred alternative are those ideas that- relate to having facilities available for public use, support environmental and educational programs, connect people to with the resources on the land, and that reinvigorate the human spirit. Its about people and connecting them to the specific activities that are available, in this case Slide Ranch. The following comments are in response to the proposed General Management Plan for GGNRA related to Slide Ranch and are my personal views and not those of Slide Ranch itself. I am currently President of the Slide Ranch Board of Directors. I've been a director for more than 8 years. Slide Ranch has separately prepared comments in response the Plan. Of the three General Plan Preliminary Alternatives, I strongly favor Alternative 1, Connecting People with Parks, for the following reasons. Slide Ranch presently substantially fulfills the intent of the Alternative 1 strategy. It accomplishes this through its land and sea based environmental and teaching farm experiences for children and families at its current site of 37 years. This coastal site inspires a sense of wonder and awe that is unlikely to be replicated elsewhere. NPS states in Concept 1 on page 6 that it wants to engage the community and other visitors "to promote understanding, enjoyment, preservation and health all as ways of invigorating the human spirit". This is what Slide Ranch is all about, every day, on its current site. While clearly in harmony with Alternative 1, Slide Ranch has also managed its resources in a way that promotes restoration of natural resources a goal of Alternative 2.</p>
-----	---	---

164	P	<p>Slide Ranch works to preserve the coastal ecosystem by removing invasive plants and maintaining trails and shore access. Further, unnecessary structures have been removed over time thus emphasizing a physical environment that has been status quo for the last 100 years more or less. I don't believe it is necessary for Slide Ranch to be removed its current location in order to promote the benefits of Alternative 2. In fact, although the Master Plan entered into between Slide Ranch and the GGNRA in 1996 or thereabouts allows for more buildings and development, Slide Ranch has not pursued that strategy. Although financing has been and continues to be a big factor in not moving forward on that plan, Slide Ranch is now pursuing a smaller and more sustainable footprint more in keeping I would argue with the intent of Alternative 2. This of course requires the cooperation of GGNRA and in my mind creates a blending of the ideas behind Alternatives 1 and 2. The concept of allowing for restoration of natural conditions in my mind should not require the removal of current Slide Ranch facilities and programs as called for in both Alternative 2 and 3. The reason is that as mentioned above there have been structures and activities on this land for several centuries, beginning with the Miwok Indians and continuing with Portuguese dairy farmers. I would argue for restoration of natural conditions consistent with the use of this land over this time frame. Further, NPS states on Page 6 in Concept 2 that "recreational and educational opportunities would allow visitors to learn about and enjoy the coastal and marine environments, and gain a better understanding of the region's international significance and history". To me this statement allows for some level of use for the land. The experiential teaching at Slide Ranch involves exploration of the tide pools and well as stewardship of the land, a use consistent with NPS goals. Visitor experiences are supported by NPS in Concept 2 where it states "Provide greater opportunities for visitors to explore the wild areas and immerse themselves in nature" and to "increase visitor understanding, awareness, and support for coastal resources through participation in stories and programs about human interaction with and dependency on natural resources". These statements could come right from a Slide Ranch teaching manual as they are core to the Slide Ranch mission.</p>
-----	---	--

164	P	<p>Natural resources are supported by NPS in Concept 2 where it states "Promote partnerships to help the park become a center for innovative coastal science, stewardship and learning". Slide Ranch, being a current Park Partner fully supports this goal.</p> <p>Lastly, relocating Slide Ranch for other purposes, such as stated in Alternative 2, namely "a location more sustainable and geologically stable and in a less remote location, to me is simply not necessary. I'm not sure what sustainable as used in this context means, but while the current site does have a level of instability associated with it, there is absolutely no current threat to existing structures and land movement is quite small. This is a very manageable circumstance and is well documented. Some may consider the Slide Ranch site remote, others not. It is within half an hours drive from San Francisco. To the extent it has an element of remoteness connected to it, I see that as one of the attributes of Slide Ranch.</p>
167	P	<p>In response to Question 1: The most preferred alternative for all areas of the GGNRA is a modified version of the 'Connecting People to the Parks' alternative. The GGNRA should NOT be managed as if it were a mythical, remote 'wilderness' area. Rather, the GGNRA SHOULD be managed for what it is: a wonderful open and undeveloped space near a very large population center that exists primarily for the enjoyment and recreation of local residents and visitors. More emphasis should be placed on improving the GGNRA facilities and maintenance efforts and less emphasis on buzzwords and policies p "stewardship" of the land and promoting "diversity". Stick to basics of good fundamental park and recreation land management practices and all visitors will benefit.</p>
167	P	<p>New buildings, such as the Crissy Field Warming Hut, should be permitted in the GGNRA to serve visitors but they should be tastefully designed and not overly commercialized. The GGNRA should NOT be governed as a 'wilderness area' but instead should balance the use of the land with a generous allowance for off and on trail hiking, horseback riding, mountain biking, camping, picnic areas, dog walking, and many other recreational activities.</p>
167	P	<p>The management plan does is unclear with regard to restrictions on access to certain various parts of the GGNRA under the various alternatives. Access limitations are almost never justified. The GGNRA is a park for the people. I disapprove of any restrictions on access to Ocean Beach in general, or the sand dunes in particular. Any restrictions to dunes would very likely be disregarded by locals and visitors, in any event, and would therefore create needless and extended conflict between visitors and the NPS.</p>

167	P	As a practical matter, the danger to shorebirds and other animals and plants in the GGNRA due to the presence of people and dogs is HIGHLY overstated. The emphasis on "preserving natural areas or "wilderness areas" in the GGNRA should be minimized in the final general management plan. These types of concerns are often raised by professional environmental and bird advocate groups whose proposals are often irrational and extremist and not tailored to a local area. The views of these professional advocates are contrary to the views of most of the general public and visitors to the GGNRA and should be given LESS importance than the views of local residents and visitors to the GGNRA in influencing the Management Plan.
167	P	The management plan does not give enough emphasis on promoting recreational activities. The picnic areas and grass fields of west crispy field are very popular and should be replicated elsewhere. Small athletic fields (e.g., for volleyball) should be encouraged in some high use areas such as picnic sites.
169	P	1. I favor Alternative 1 and need to stress that having such a wonderful resource that so many people from out of town and from the Bay Area can use because access is easy thru public transportation. There is no public transportation to any large open space in the community where I live now and I miss the ability to save gas to be able to visit many places.
169	P	The GGNRA is a neighbor of the residents of the Bay Area. As the Bay Area continues to become more and more a place for only a certain economic class of citizens to live, how in good conscience can you take away some of the best free things to do in the area? Is the GGNRA just going to become another elitist NIMBY like so many people who live in the area? I had to relocate due to the economic circumstances of the Bay Area. If you continue on the path you are taking, the NPS will help add to the diaspora of the middle class from the Bay Area.
171	P	1. I prefer Alternative 1/Concept 1: Connecting People with Parks, which has a goal of "bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population," and enhancing access, rather than making the park less accessible.
171	P	3. All the alternatives/concepts are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources.
174	P	An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is important because dog walking is currently enjoyed by thousands of park visitors in the GGNRA and has been a huge activity here since the creation of the original GGNRA Pet Policy in 1979. Off-leash dog walking is a safe, healthy recreational activity that provides a critical connection to nature and the outdoors for urban dwellers, and creates an important sense of community, too. Off-leash dog walking is not only healthy for dogs, but it is also very healthy for people. It is an activity that is enjoyed by all genders, races, ages and economic levels. Please remember that these areas were deeded to the GGNRA with the explicit understanding that the existing recreation, including off-leash/voice control dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.

174	P	<p>I consider myself a life-long environmentalist. I have been vegan since 1980, live consciously and non-toxic/organically as much as possible, support many different environmental and wildlife organizations, as well as having worked as a wildlife rehabilitator while living in Oregon for some time in the 90s. I feel the alternatives presented are too heavily biased toward the creation of so-called sensitive habitats, rather than balancing access, recreation and conservation for the areas in question. These are urban parks and need special consideration due to their location. People need to use these areas - they make San Francisco livable for many of us that need that connection to nature and wildlife to survive.</p>
174	P	<p>But I also think natural areas should be left alone/left natural, and not renovated, fenced off, sectioned off, and labeled with interpretative signs. What has been done to Crissy Field, for example, is a joke because it was supposedly done to make the area "more natural". Yes, it is beautifully groomed now - more palpable to humans, more parking, paths and places to bar-b-q and buy a latte. But it also went from being a wonderful, rustic, eco-friendly, sparsely used habitat/environment where dog walkers and wildlife co-existed to a complete Disneyland with huge crowds of people. There's all these ridiculous roped in, fenced-off areas now - everything is segregated. It's insane. Do you really think nature or wildlife will read the signs or stay in the roped in sections to stay in their own little nature habitats you've created for them? The numbers of wild animals at this location has gone way down, while the number of human visitors has way gone up. All in an effort to make it more "natural". And now you want the dogs out of there because they're a problem for the wildlife? You've got to be kidding? You don't think the hundreds of beach-goers, kite-boarders, kite-flyers, swimmers, soccer-layers, joggers, baby strollers, etc. etc. walkers has any impact at all or less so than the dogs accompanied by their human walkers? It was frankly much more natural before it was renovated - I can tell you this as a long time visitor.</p>
174	P	<p>However, I do think keeping access open to humans is still really important - even now, when areas like Crissy Field are more like an urban landscaped park than a true natural area anymore. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with the protection of natural resources/wildlife.</p>
174	P	<p>I have maintained an uncommon level of health while living with a debilitating life-threatening disease due in large part to my daily walks with my voice-controlled dogs in these areas. If I did not have access to these areas, I would simply not be able to live here - despite being a native Bay Area resident. My health depends on being able to walk in these areas with my dogs off-leash. It is critical to my everyday quality of life to get out in natural areas and walk with my "family".</p>
174	P	<p>Please consider how these changes will impact those of us that rely on these areas for daily recreational activities (including off-leash dog walking) and enjoyment of these unique urban open spaces in our own ways.</p>

175	P	Of the preliminary alternatives, I strongly prefer Alternative 1 - Connecting People with Parks, which serves to increase park access for a greater number and wider variety of people. I was, however, concerned to see that there was no mention of off leash dog walking mentioned in any of the alternatives. Off leash dog walking is a healthy activity for both dogs and their humans, on a number of different levels. Obviously, on the purely physical level, it is healthy for bodies to move around in the fresh air but, perhaps more importantly, it creates and promotes an important social network and - in a significant number of instances- it may be the strongest, or even the only, socialization available to people who are otherwise isolated. The sheer variety of people who are brought together daily - initially bonded by nothing more than their shared love of their dogs - is unparalleled by any other use of these areas. The people who gather together on a daily basis are a perfect representation of the diversity of our city - they come from all age groups, ethnicities, and socioeconomic backgrounds.
176	P	1. Most important to include is the goal of "bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population," and enhancing access, rather than making the park less accessible.
176	P	. An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This is especially important at Fort Funston where off-leash activity is the most common use, and the park that can often be cold, windy and otherwise unattractive to tourists. Dog walking is enjoyed by a diversity of park visitors (unlike most National Park activities, where poor people and people of color are severely underrepresented). And finally, Fort Funston was deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.
177	P	public transportation for both visitors and employees should be improved within this area of the Park.
177	P	I would like to express my thoughts on the accessibility of the Parks to all people with regards to not just Alcatraz, but the entire Park. I understand that high end hotels can draw in increased tourism and funds for the park but I feel as though that completely contradicts the mission of the NPS."...to promote and regulate the use of the...national parks...which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Filling the GGNRA with hotels and warming huts does nothing to conserve scenery, history or wildlife, nor does it welcome lower income families who will likely come to view the park as an elitist institution that they cannot afford to explore.
179	P	#1 Alternative #1 "Connecting People With Parks" is the only version that comes close to the original concept of the GGNRA which was to provide open space for recreational opportunities in an urban setting. Since the GGNRA was created the urban population has grown tremendously and so the need for recreational space is more important than ever. So the plan should stress accessibility to the park. Instead the emphasis is on natural resource protection. Recreational uses and preserving natural resources can co-exist.

179	P	<p>#2 The plan and the description of current uses does not reflect reality. There was little mention of off leash dog walking, yet thousands of people walk their dogs daily across the GGNRA. When San Francisco deeded our parklands to the GGNRA under Mayor Alioto it was with the explicit guarantee that off leash dog walking and other traditional forms of recreation would be protected. The GGNRA then developed and implemented the 1979 Pet Policy and later added an addendum in 1996. This policy was used successfully for 20 years and should be continued with additional lands added. Currently it is estimated that 35-40% of households have a dog. Of those, homeowners are a larger per capita percentage than renters. How can the plan ignore such a significant constituency? The majority of dog owners consider themselves environmentalists and want to preserve and share parkland.</p> <p>The Management Zones proposed are too small and too limiting to accommodate the thousands of daily visitors and the variety of activities they engage in. Hang gliding, horseback riding, surfing, swimming, fishing, mountain biking, kiteboarding, windsurfing, sailing, dog walking, etc. How can a plan be implemented if it does not reflect accurately the current uses of the park?</p>
180	P	<p>I wish to preserve the existing equestrian facilities and trail access which may in the future be affected by decisions taken by your General Management Planning Team GGNRA. The above-named stables have successfully operated for decades. These facilities are well known and highly utilized. Most are at or near full capacity, confirming the enduring popularity of horseback riding and the continuing urgent need for horse boarding facilities in these coastal areas. Our stables enjoy wide public support and aid many sectors of the local economy (hay and grain production, feed stores, tack stores, online providers, veterinarians, farriers, instructors, rodeos, shows, restaurants, etc.) All of these interests would suffer if riding or horse boarding opportunities were reduced.</p> <p>As urban areas encroach on rural preserves, it becomes all the more important that the government recognize that before the advent of GGNRA our equine facilities were already responsible and established custodians of these lands. The trails have been cared for; they are not degraded. Precautions have been taken not to pollute the seasonal streams. Buildings have been kept to a minimum. Dirt bikes and off-road vehicles that would destroy the natural habitat have been discouraged in an effort to preserve the areas. We continue to be good stewards of the land.</p>

180	P	With the continued high level of interest in horseback riding, horse camps for children, hourly lessons and horse boarding, it is only reasonable that the local facilities be allowed to continue operating in our coastal areas. Urban residents enjoy these traditional pastimes and value the proximity of our stables to the cities. As construction encroaches on open spaces it becomes more difficult to maintain equestrian facilities. Nevertheless, riding remains very popular and I wish to support our equestrian facilities in the planned Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
184	P	Alternative 1 -- Connecting People with the Parks -- comes the closest to upholding the reason the GGNRA was created: "to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment and planning." However, none of the Alternative Management Concepts proposed are acceptable as stated, since all place too little emphasis on recreational uses and recreational access to sites within the GGNRA.
184	P	An element missing from all the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This activity provides exercise for people as well as dogs. Dog walking is enjoyed by a diversity of park visitors in the GGNRA, unlike most National Park activities, where poor people and people of color are severely underrepresented. Sites were deeded to the GGNRA with the understanding that the existing recreation, such as dog walking, would NOT be eliminated.
184	P	All the alternatives are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources. All of our local beaches were ceded to GGNRA. This space is the necessary breathing room our crowded city needs.
185	P	I fill it is very important to keep the equestrians in Golden Gate Park it is part of the history of Park and San Francisco.
185	L	I am responding to the alternatives that are proposed for the new general pan for the parks. I am an equestrian and I support the majority of the concepts in Alternative 1, however Alternative 1 does not apply to all the area. The final plan should take into account the need to retain existing stables, provide more trails (especially a variety of different length loop trails) and regional connections, provide adequate rig parking for equestrians, identify water sources for livestock, and provide unpaved trail surfaces for both joggers, bicyclists and horses. I also support multi-use trails, with the exception of the trails in the Phleger Estate. Creation of volunteer trail patrols is vital to provide 'eyes and ears" in the new property.

186	P	<p>1. Alternative 1, Connecting People with the Parks, comes closest to upholding the reason the GGNRA was created, which was "to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment and planning." However, none of the Alternative Management Concepts are acceptable as stated, because all of them place too little emphasis on recreational uses and recreational access to sites within the GGNRA. Expansion of recreational access was a major reason that much of the land was deeded to the federal government.</p>
186	P	<p>2. The Management Zones proposed at individual sites within the GGNRA are too exclusive. Where is RECREATION in the "Diverse Opportunities" it is never mentioned! Much larger areas should be included for recreation, which is the origin of the GGNRA. Off-leash dog walking, which is one of the traditional recreational activities in the GGNRA, is mentioned only at Fort Funston (current conditions), but not noted, suggested or indicated anywhere else. Nor is dog walking shown in any of photos of the GGNRA. This is one of the most loved activities among Bay Area residents who walk in the GGNRA. It should be celebrated and expanded.</p>
186	P	<p>3. Current conditions described at individual sites in the GGNRA are incorrect. For example, as noted above, dog walking is only mentioned under current conditions at Fort Funston, while it is more broadly based and permitted, according to the 1979 Pet Policy. A more accurate description of the current recreational uses at all sites must be made before any General Management Plan alternatives can be considered. The General Management Plan as currently constituted is highly prejudicial against recreational access, in direct violation of the legislation that created the GGNRA and against the promises made by the GGNRA at the time of its creation that traditional recreational uses would be protected and preserved.</p>
187	P	<p>As an avid equestrian who frequently rides in GGNRA, I support preservation of equestrian facilities at Ember Ridge, Picardo Ranch (Millwood), SFPUC Watershed easements, Moss Beach Ranch, Ocean View Stables, Renegade Ranch, Presidio Riding Club, Miwok Stables, and Golden Gate Dairy. I especially support continued equestrian access to riding trails at: Milagra Ridge, Shelldance Nursery area, Sweeney Ridge, Cattle Hill, Mori Point, Pedro Point, Devil's Slide, San Pedro Mountain (all south of San Francisco), Phleger Estate, as well as trails in Marin County and in San Francisco that are located on GGNRA lands.</p>
189	P	<p>I conditionally prefer Alternative 1. I like it because has the goal of "Connecting People with Parks." The GGNRA current policies seem to be more about bringing in native plants & sensitive species, rather than preserving park access for people. The Organic Act and ESA already provide protection for natural resources. The GGNRA was established to provide for both conservation AND recreational opportunities. I'm concerned that Alternative 2 and 3 might provide justification for the GGNRA to further restrict recreation.</p>

189	P	<p>Note that "Connecting people with parks" should NOT be restricted to activities like "educating" people about native plants and endangered/threatened species. For example, connection to the parks has to be more than teaching environmentalism to children, i.e. school children on field trips & higher schoolers fulfilling their community service requirement. As an educator, naturalist, and scientist I fully support people learning about nature. However, this is only one aspect of "connection to parks."</p>
189	P	<p>Another important connection is Recreation. Recreation is people voluntarily going to the parks to enjoy nature & family & friends & exercise. We need more of this in the parks. That means family-friendly facilities like good garbage service, clean bathrooms (not outhouses), good public transportation as well as accessible parking.</p>
189	P	<p>1) An important element missing from the alternatives is OFF-LEASH DOG WALKING. Although this will be more specifically addressed in the Dog Management Plan, the General Management Plan, i.e. the policies for next decades, also needs to acknowledge that off-leash dog walking is a recreation enjoyed by thousands of park visitors. There is a long history of people enjoying nature accompanied by a dog. John Muir, Aldo Leopold, etc. all had off-leash dogs aside them. Even the local Sierra Club sponsors off-leash dog walking in Bay Area parks (despite the protests of some SC members). Having off-leash dog walking is not about the GGNRA creating sites beyond the current 1% of parklands, but rather preserving the off-leash recreation that existed when the park lands were deeded to the NPS.</p> <p>Note that off-leash dog walking is enjoyed by a wide DIVERSITY of park visitors. For example, go out to Fort Funston and you'll see people of color from all ethnicities, seniors, families with children, teenagers, the rich and poor. Contrast this to "environmental" activities or many other park activities where white middle-class & upper-class visitors are the vast majority (not referring to mandatory school field trips/assignments or community service requirements) and "faces of color" are the exception.</p> <p>Both the NPS and California State Parks have recognized the disparity between the demographics of park visitors and the general population. Any reduction of off-leash dog walking will increase this disparity by discouraging many from ever visiting the parks. It's very disheartening to see the GGNRA constantly fighting off-leash dog walking. Dog walking is one of the most successful program in the GGNRA, i.e. low-cost, addresses the needs of a diverse urban population, enhances community & exercise, even though it isn't even promoted/publicized by the GGNRA.</p>

189	P	2) Also missing from the Plan is mention of an entire Kingdom, Fungi. Prior to the park lands becoming part of the NPS, members of the SF Mycological Society and others enjoyed foraging for wild mushrooms throughout the parks. Note that mushrooms are the fruiting body of the fungus, analogous to berries. The GGNRA has limits only on the amount of berries that can be picked, not where. Compare this to mushroom picking, which is restricted to a very small area. Foraging for food is the most intimate connection people can have to the parks. Responsible foraging (with rules based on science, not politics) should be encouraged, rather than discouraged.
189	P	1) All the alternatives are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than conservation and recreation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved. The scientific evidence (i.e. data, not the "interpretation" from GGNRA biologists, BeachWatch) and Birds Counts from the Audubon Society, indicate that off-leash dog walking has *co-existed with the protection of natural resources.
189	P	2) Please based the Environmental Review on science. The environmental impact assessments should be based on the science of "ecology," not the politics of "environmentalism." The fake Lynx Fur incident and fabricated impacts of oyster farming in Pt. Reyes, indicate the necessity of establishing and exercising a Scientific Code of Conduct/Scientific Code of Ethics. *For example, the population of the Western Snowy Plover has no correlation (correlation coefficient is less than 0.1) with the number of off-leash dogs, or correlation with the park restrictions/status on off-leash dog walking at Ocean Beach. Additionally, the greatest number of birds is often found in the same sites where there are large numbers of dog walkers.
191	P	3. Why is research listed as a possible use only for areas zoned as "Sensitive Resources?" I would support research as a permitted use in most of the areas of the park.
193	L	Many thanks, in advance for reading my letter. As an equestrian I support the majority of the concepts in Alternative 1. However, Alternative 1 does not apply to the entire area. The final plan should take into account the need to retain existing stables, provide more trails (especially a variety of different length loop trails) and regional connections, provide adequate rig parking for equestrians, identify water sources for livestock, and provide unpaved trail surfaces for both joggers, bicyclists and horses. I also support multi-use trails, with the exception of the trails in the Phleger Estate. (For this area, please refer to ETRAC's earlier proposed multi-use trail bordering Filoli and Watershed lands from Canada Road up to Skyline) Creation of volunteer trail patrols is vital to provide "eyes and ears" in the new property.
196	P	Topic 1: I prefer Alternative 1/Concept 1: Connecting People with Parks, which has a goal of "bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population," and enhancing access, rather than making the park less accessible.

197	P	<p>The action alternatives force users to choose between recreation (Alt 1), conservation (Alt 2), and historic preservation (Alt 3), when most users want to see each of these approaches pursued in locations where they are most appropriate. Most of our members want to see strong conservation in area that are critical or where aggressive conservation does not conflict with recreation. While we strongly want recreational uses that cannot be replaced elsewhere in the immediate area to be preserved and protected, we also want to see historic preservation and conservation occur. All three approaches are important and we support them all while we recognize that one may be more important than the other in a specific area that is not the subject of an area plan.</p>
197	P	<p>The impact on recreational use by commercial/large non-profit uses should be carefully considered. At Ft. Baker waterfront, the Discovery Museum at peak use takes up all of their own parking plus all north waterfront parking including the use of all boat ramp parking that is supposed to be reserved for trailer parking. Once parking is reduced at the north waterfront, this overflow will take up parking at Pt. Cavallo as well. Introduction of other organized and commercial uses like this that draw crowds should be carefully considered so that their success does not displace or significantly impact recreational users.</p>
197	L	<p>I have been attending scoping sessions and trying to digest the verbose alternatives presented as visions of the park's future. I fear for any of these alternatives as they all in one way or another create more restrictions on the park's uses and set up a sanitized homogeneous experience from park to park. I worry that the bureaucracy will create a "big box" type of experience in the park. The GGNRA was originally created to be a close by getaway spot where urban dwellers and tourists could go to have a wilderness experience in "their own backyard" so to speak. To have such gorgeous natural habitat in such close proximity to a heavily populated urban area is unique to this region of the country.</p>
197	L	<p>I have been enjoying this park on horseback for 36 years. I am in fact a member of the Marin Municipal Water District Volunteer Mounted Patrol. When I first began riding in the GGNRA, there were many fewer people than now & everyone was on foot or horseback. The GGNRA lands are historically dairy and ranch lands and were in fact discovered on horseback as settlers moved west. This is an important part of our California history. It is important to me that equestrian use continues and that the stable facilities remain in place and are even improved.</p>

197	L	<p>Since the increased population and recent creation of the mountain bike have added traffic to the park, I recognize the needs for safety oriented controls in the park. The use of signage and distribution of maps and interpretive information is certainly of value. But I do not want to see “interpretive” information turning into the sanitized prepackaged park experience that robs visitors of their own experience of nature. Mountain bikes, non motorized vehicles, have no historic precedent in the park. I do respect the desires of people to explore the parks by bike but do wish traffic restrictions to be put in place such that accidents are avoided. This is most important on single track trails with impeded sightlines that do not enable bike riders and other users to get out of each other’s way in sufficient time to avoid a crash. There is no historic precedent for any vehicles in the park other than the early 20th century vehicles used by ranchers when the parklands were private property.</p>
197	L	<p>I have seen many children in the park who have never seen or been close to a horse. The media has been full of articles about children and adults suffering from “nature deprivation”. Children delight in the sight of our horses when we ride them through the parks and delight in the opportunity to pet them. Our horses love kids and it gives us an opportunity to teach the children about their nature. 100 years ago children were riding horses to school, not bikes & carpools. Our horses have an important place in our history and that of the park. Without them, transportation would not have been possible in the last century let alone discovery of the very parks we are trying to manage. We must not lose sight of this in the general management plan.</p>
197	L	<p>I am middle aged and ride with many people who have disabilities and infirmities. To these people, their horses are their “legs” who transport them through the park for a serene and spiritual experience of nature. These are people who are unable to hike or ride a bike into the hills that compose our GGNRA. It would be in violation of the rights of disabled people to take away their “legs” such that they could not access the areas they support through their taxpayer dollars. It is of paramount importance to me that all the existing trails are preserved the way they are and no additional restrictions placed on them for equestrian use. In addition, I’d like to see refined parking and staging opportunities for trailering our horses into the parks.</p>
197	L	<p>The trail system is excellent as it is in the park and I see no reason to change it other than maintaining what is there and preventing erosion, primarily due to natural forces of winter storms and drainage patterns resulting from rainfall runoff, fallen tree limbs, etc.</p>

197	L	<p>I am very cognizant of the fact that along with the increase of the population in the Bay Area and the commercialization of the outdoor sporting industry has come greatly increased human traffic in the GGNRA. Along with any increases in traffic and congestion comes a need for some traffic controls. Also, many visitors are unaware that they are visiting a wilderness area & need some guidance so they don't get lost. Having proper maps & signage as well as some historical information available to enhance their understanding of where they are visiting is a good thing. But too much of packaged park experience rings hollow and causes a very sterilized experience of something which is supposed to be uplifting and inspiring. Too much of today's media robs one of the ability to create one's own experience. The park has always been a place where one can go to be reflective of life and nature. This quality must be retained. And maintaining the presence of the horse in the park is an essential component since we are indebted to this magnificent animal who carried our settlers thousands of miles to discover these very lands.</p>
198	P	<p>A. Fishing: I oppose any changes to GGNRA management policies and practices that would result in the restriction of recreational fishing opportunities beyond those restrictions in effect on Jan. 1, 2008. At the very least, the GGNRA should not restrict recreational fishing from shores, piers, jetties or other similar structures in the Pacific Ocean or in the San Francisco Bay and Delta region (as currently defined by the California Department of Fish and Game) beyond the regulations that the California Department of Fish and Game or federal fisheries management agencies may legally establish from time to time. The GGNRA also should seek to minimize restrictions on recreational fishing by divers, and recreational fishing from nonmotorized vessels and from motorized vessels with a combined capacity for crew and passengers of six people or fewer.</p>
198	P	<p>Fishing: The GGNRA should explicitly state that recreational fishing is allowed on all sandy beaches and all rocky shorelines, and in all intertidal areas. The GGNRA should explicitly state that visitors are allowed access to all shore areas up to the maximum high-tide line. Limited areas may be temporarily closed to fishing for reasons of safety or security or when required for the restoration of a jetty, pier, or historic or natural resource. However, public notice of such non-emergency closures must be provided through established procedures before the closure is approved. All closures of longer than one year must be reviewed, re-noticed and re-established at the end of that year, for no longer than one additional year. After the second year, such closures may be established for up to an additional three years (to total five years of closure), after which they may be re-authorized for additional periods of five years. Thereafter, if the GGNRA wishes to continue such closures, they must be reviewed, re-noticed and re-established every five years or less.</p>

198	P	<p>The GGNRA must maintain in serviceable condition all jetties and all piers currently used for fishing under its jurisdiction. The GGNRA should establish an outreach program to educate recreational fishers about proposed changes and adopted changes to rules and regulations. At a minimum, written notice of proposed changes and newly effective rules must be provided on the GGNRA's National Park Service Web site, and must be prominently posted at the entry to the fishing pier (also known as Torpedo Pier) near the Warming Hut in the Presidio, and at the entry to the fishing pier on the west side of the harbor at Fort Baker. Such notice must be provided in English, Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Vietnamese and Russian, and in any additional languages the GGNRA may determine are appropriate. The GGNRA also should liaison with local tackle shops and fishing-supply stores as a secondary means of outreach.</p>
198	P	<p>The GGNRA should examine the feasibility of establishing use fees for fishing in some or all of the marine and estuarine environments within its jurisdiction. The GGNRA should examine the feasibility of requiring all fishers older than 16 years of age to pay either a daily fee or a yearly fee, but the yearly fee should not exceed the purchase price of an individual state fishing license for the same year. Revenues from any such fees established must be used to improve or maintain fishing opportunities within the GGNRA, including cleanup and restoration of shoreline areas, and restoration of marine and estuarine habitats. Fee revenues also may be used to support the enforcement of state and federal fishing regulations, by the NPS or California DFG, including the cost of materials and staff time. Fee revenues must not be redirected for any other purpose.</p>
198	P	<p>B. Dogs: The GGNRA should establish appropriate areas where visitors may allow their dogs to roam freely without the use of leashes, and should provide water, restrooms, benches, trash-disposal containers and other appropriate amenities for visitors using these off-leash areas. On all land under GGNRA management outside of these areas, the GGNRA should vigorously enforce its existing regulations governing the time, place and manner in which visitors may bring their dogs to the GGNRA, particularly in beach and shoreline areas.</p>
198	P	<p>The GGNRA should use empirical research to estimate how many dogs (whether with their owners, professional dog-walkers or other people) enter the boundaries of the GGNRA in a given year (except for dogs that may be merely transported through the GGNRA to other destinations). The GGNRA should then survey off-leash dog parks in the 10 largest cities providing such parks in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, to determine how many square feet are provided for each dog using a given park. The GGNRA should then establish off-leash areas within the GGNRA with sufficient area to provide a per-dog area no less than the median number of square feet per dog provided in the 10 surveyed cities and no more than the maximum number of square feet per dog by any of the surveyed cities.</p>

198	P	<p>The GGNRA should provide water, benches, restrooms, trash receptacles or other amenities, as it determines is appropriate for each off-leash dog area. Whenever possible, the GGNRA should minimize activities that might disrupt the normal use of these established off-leash areas. The GGNRA should actively encourage dog owners to use these off-leash areas. The GGNRA should, after providing appropriate public notice, make a practice of enforcing rules restricting off-leash dogs in all other areas under its jurisdiction. The GGNRA should actively warn people accompanying off-leash dogs about these rules, even if no complaint about a particular dog or incident has been received.</p>
198	P	<p>Outside of these established off-leash areas, the GGNRA should make a reasonable effort to accommodate leashed dogs. But when the presence of dogs conflicts with the needs of wildlife on land or in the water, or with the reasonable enjoyment of the GGNRA by people without dogs, the GGNRA should establish whatever policies and practices it deems necessary regarding the time, place and manner in which dogs may use the GGNRA.</p>
198	P	<p>C. Development: The GGNRA should seek to minimize the addition of new hardscape on lands under its jurisdiction. It also should reject proposals for new development that are not directly related to active outdoor recreation uses, passive observation of wildlife or natural features, or the preservation and enjoyment of existing historic resources. If the GGNRA determines that certain new development is appropriate, it should restrict that development to the ground footprint of the existing built environment and should limit parking for private automobiles to no more than existing capacity.</p>
198	P	<p>D. Environment: The GGNRA should seek to preserve and restore the natural environment, whenever such preservation and restoration does not conflict with the other policies and practices recommended in this letter. Landscapes and life forms known to exist in a given region of the GGNRA before the year 1775 should be protected and restored in that region whenever feasible, and native life forms should be preferred over non-native forms.</p>

200	L	<p>It is extremely important that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area continue to be hospitable to equestrians. One of the great things about our culture of the American West is that horseback riding remains accessible to persons of all income levels and abilities. We want to keep it that way. In Europe and elsewhere around the world, horse sports are limited to wealthy people. Here, thanks to our ranching traditions, even an Oakland working woman like me can trailer my mare to ride in view of the Golden Gate. Kids with disabilities — like my own son — become inspired and empowered when they are able to enjoy horses and riding.</p> <p>Enclosed you will find a petition with about 35 signatures, primarily from horse lovers in the East Bay who also visit the GGNRA for horse camping and day use, supporting the continued presence of horses in the proposed Golden Gate National Park lands. If stables were to be closed, horse concessions “concentrated”, and trail access denied to equestrians, this is in violation of what a large segment of the public wants done with our tax dollars. For minimal ecological impact, horse facilities should be spread throughout appropriate areas.</p> <p>Despite our weakened economy, horse keeping continues. Lots of us have a passion for the sport and the lifestyle of being around horses. We want to continue to share this passion with youth and others who can benefit from this great traditional use of public park lands.</p> <p>Please continue to work with local equestrian groups to ensure respectful treatment of all the stakeholders and proper environmental protections.</p>
-----	---	--

201	L	<p>From: Supporters of horseback riding in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area</p> <p>Re: (1) Support for preservation of equestrian facilities: Ember Ridge, Picardo Ranch (Millwood), SFPUC Watershed easements, Moss Beach Ranch, Ocean View Stables, Renegade Ranch, Presidio Riding Club, Miwok Stables and Golden Gate Dairy.</p> <p>(2) Support for continued equestrian access to riding trails: Milagra Ridge, Shelldance Nursery area, Sweeney Ridge, Cattle Hill, Mon Point, Pedro Point, Devil's Slide, San Pedro Mountain (all south of San Francisco), Phleger Estate as well as trails in Mann County and in San Francisco that are located on GGNRA lands.</p> <p>We the undersigned seek to preserve the existing equestrian facilities and trail access which may in the future be affected by decisions taken by your General Management Planning Team — GGNRA. The above-named stables have successfully operated for decades in our local areas. These facilities are well known and highly utilized. Most are at or near full capacity, confirming the enduring popularity of horseback riding and the continuing urgent need for horse boarding facilities in these coastal areas. Our stables enjoy wide public support and aid many sectors of the local economy (hay and grain production, feed stores, tack stores, online providers, veterinarians, farriers, instructors, rodeos, shows, restaurants, etc.). All of these interests would suffer if riding or horse boarding opportunities were reduced.</p> <p>As urban areas encroach on rural preserves, it becomes all the more important that the government recognize that before the advent of GGNRA our equine facilities were already responsible and established custodians of these lands. The trails have been cared for; they are not degraded. Precautions have been taken not to pollute the seasonal streams. Buildings have been kept to a minimum. Dirt bikes and off-road vehicles that would destroy the natural habitat have been discouraged in an effort to preserve the areas. We continue to be good stewards of the land.</p> <p>With the continued high level of interest in horseback riding, horse camps for children, hourly lessons and horse boarding, it is only reasonable that the local facilities be allowed to continue operating in our coastal areas. Urban residents enjoy these traditional pastimes and value the proximity of our stables to the cities. As construction encroaches on open spaces it becomes more difficult to maintain equestrian facilities. Nevertheless, riding remains very popular and we the undersigned need and support our equestrian facilities in the planned Golden Gate National Recreation Area.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to our petition and please find attached signatures supporting the continuance and enhancement</p>
-----	---	---

203	P	<p>Alternative 1, Connecting People With Parks, comes closest to meeting the needs of this urban national recreation area, and I think the word "recreation, as this "park" has been called, is important, to remember that we in the city of San Francisco gave our ocean beaches to the Federal Park service, after receiving a guarantee that the people of San Francisco and the surrounding urban area would be able to continue to use the area for recreation. The GGNRA is already highly accessible to people, including those without cars, and provides free access to this wonderful area for all economic classes, and for all ages (though more access for wheelchair users would be possible, such as at Ft. Funston, where the wheelchair accessible circle loop was not maintained). More could still be done to help introduce families and school children to the GGNRA, to guarantee continued use and support for this treasure.</p> <p>I think conserving the natural environment is important too, but I don't think very much of the GGNRA should be taken back to the pre-urban era - hopefully enough to show city people what the environment was like, and to provide more habitat, especially for bees. I'd like to see the major portion of the GGNRA conserved for natural beauty and for wear and tear in high use areas.</p> <p>I don't like to see a national park becoming a shopping center (such as the big box stores at Crissy Field), but I understand the need to have the park pay for itself. I also think it is appropriate to preserve the history of the area as a presidio and then U.S. Fort and the military base, but I hope that can be contained and done tastefully (as the plan appears to be so far). I've just visited Fort Baker (for lunch and a walk) and that appears to have turned out very well.</p>
203	P	<p>An element missing from the alternatives is the importance of off-leash dog walking. This was one of the recreational activities that was included when the city of San Francisco gave Ft. Funston to the GGNRA, and it is especially necessary to include the off-leash dog walking in as many areas of the GGNRA as possible (the historical use of GGNRA land was about 2%, so I hope at least that can be included in the new plans). The beaches are about the best places for dogs to run loose (under their humans supervision, of course), since there is more space for everyone to spread out on the beaches, and fewer user conflicts (such as beach volley ball and frisbee games or picnics), and the beaches are the best places for humans with dogs to give both species a long walk, making the city an easy place to keep up our physical fitness without the people having to join a gym or the dogs to have to pay for expensive dog agility or flyball practice space. The bluffs at Ft. Funston are also a wonderful area for off-leash dogs, as is the meadow at Crissy Field, so I hope those will continue to be part of the GGNRA plans.</p>

203	P	I also have personal experience taking my dogs for long walks on leash near Tennessee Valley, and I hope these will continue to be available. I believe other parts of the GGNRA are also good for including dogs for walks on leash, but I don't know the others (I prefer the East Bay Regional Parks which have a good amount of off-leash hiking areas, or for longer leash walks I also go to the Marin Water District) - but with gas prices going up, having more off-leash and on-leash areas near peoples homes is important.
203	P	The GGNRA needs to be a "good neighbor" since it is really part of an overall urban area, not a wilderness area far from a high density population. It is especially important that the GGNRA continue to provide recreational areas, including off-leash dog walking, since many parts of the GGNRA were given to the Federal Park service with that stipulation, and because the growing population of the area is putting pressure on all available open space for multiple users. People with dogs, who need "real" exercise for both of us, not just a small dog-park, are one of the large and important user groups.
205	L	As a member of the equestrian community, I wish to go on record in strong support of alternative 1: Connecting People with the Parks. This is the only alternative that preserves the current stables in GGNRA parkland in Mann county. I also am strongly in support of the continued safe use of the GGNRA trails by equestrians, cyclists and hikers. I am very concerned that alternatives 2 and 3 may results in a severe decrease in access to the trails by the public. The GGNRA trails system along with Point Reyes National Seashore is one of the best trail systems in the US and the entire world. There is a long history of public access to these trails which are located in proximity to a large urban area. It is appropriate that such a resource maximize trail access while also preserving the natural beauty of the area. I realize that there are advocates for all points of view including treating the GGNRA as an off-limits wilderness area with very limited public access.
205	L	I am reminded of a story about a young driver that has just received their first traffic ticket for running a red light. This young person appears before a judge to plead innocent. The judge declares that "everyone is guilty at one time or another" and nothing the young person says will persuade the judge to dismiss the fine. (In fun?) the judge says that he normally considers three alternatives as punishment in these types of cases. Alternative (1) is a 100 dollar fine. Alternative 2 is life in prison. Alternative 3 is death by hanging. Since this is a first offence the judge says "pay the clerk 100 dollars, next guilty person please". I do hope this is a situation with the 100 dollar fine. Why do I feel like I am being punished ?

205	L	<p>In closing I would like to bring up one other matter. The biggest issue for me is saving the trails. My personal friend Mr. Sandy Greenblat has provided you with detailed information about trail improvements that we need. I am very happy that GGNRA is working with the Marin Horse Council to let the equestrian community raise funds and even help with the installation of any approved trail changes. I would encourage you to maximize this process as a required part of the new written plan. I do not have a specific plan in mind however I feel that the fate of the process should not be left to just a few dedicated individuals like Sandy Greenblat. There should be a GGNRA "required process" that ensures better communication with the public with an active fund raising element for trail improvements.</p>
207	P	<p>Topic 1: None of the Alternative Management Concepts proposed is acceptable as stated because all place too little emphasis on recreational uses and recreational access to sites within the GGNRA. Of the three proposals, Alternative 1 -- Connecting People with the Parks -- comes the closes to upholding the reason the GGNRA was created in the first place: "to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment and planning." But even Alternative 1 does not provide enough recreational access at the sites within the GGNRA.</p>
207	P	<p>The other two Alternatives are so heavily weighted toward conservation at the expense of recreational access that they are completely unacceptable. To be true to the legislation that Congress passed to create the GGNRA, any final General Management Plan (GMP) has to include a realistic and fair balance between recreational access, conservation, and historical preservation. We need a much more integrated approach, not the polarizing alternatives listed in newsletter #4. Recreation must be protected in the GGNRA.</p>
207	P	<p>None of the three alternatives listed integrates recreational access, conservation, and historical preservation into a realistic, workable, enforceable approach to managing the lands of the GGNRA.</p> <p>Note that Connecting People to the Parks, the title of Alternative 1, can be accomplished as much through ensuring people have recreational access to the GGNRA as through teaching them about native plants.</p>
207	P	<p>Topic 2: The value of recreation is missing from all three alternatives. The word "recreation" isn't even used. It's included in "diverse opportunities." This euphemism reflects the desire by GGNRA management to denigrate the importance of recreational access, even though recreation is one of the driving reasons behind the creation of the GGNRA. The loss of recreational access cannot be allowed.</p>

207	P	<p>In particular, off-leash recreation is completely missing from the alternatives. Dogs aren't even mentioned, except at Fort Funston, as if that is the only place where dogs can be found in the GGNRA. This is untrue, misleading, and outright deceitful. Off-leash dog walking has taken place in the GGNRA since before the lands were turned into a national recreational area. The 1979 Pet Policy allowed off-leash dog walking on 1% of GGNRA lands. To pretend that off-leash dog walking is not an integral activity within the GGNRA is just plain wrong. Note that off-leash dog walking is enjoyed by a wide diversity of people, including all ethnic groups, gay, straight, young, old, families with kids, seniors, disabled, wealthy, poor, and all manner of professions. I challenge you to show me any other activity in the GGNRA -- including voluntary planting and weeding of native plants-- where you see that kind of diversity. If the GGNRA wants to encourage all different kinds of people to visit, off-leash dog walking must be allowed to continue.</p>
207	P	<p>Topic 3: The Management Zones proposed at individual sites within the GGNRA are much too exclusive in nature. The GGNRA needs maximum flexibility when making management decisions. The designation of "Diverse Opportunities", which includes recreational access (while never actually saying the word "recreation"), should cover much larger areas of the GGNRA, not just tiny, isolated islands of "diverse opportunities" shown in the current proposals. Recreational access, including off-leash dog walking, can co-exist with conservation (and have for decades), but the management zones in this GMP assume there can be no shared space. This attitude must change.</p>
207	P	<p>The current conditions described at individual sites in the GGNRA are not correct. Current recreational uses are not accurately represented at most sites. For example, off-leash dog walking is only mentioned at Fort Funston, even though a majority of park users at many sites, including Ocean Beach and other locations, are there to walk their dogs off-leash. A more accurate description of the current recreational uses at all sites must be made before any GMP alternatives can be considered.</p>
207	P	<p>Newsletter #4 says that the "Park Purpose" is: "To offer national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population while preserving and interpreting the park's outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values." This is not accurate. The legislation that created the GGNRA in 1972 makes it clear that the purpose for the creation of the GGNRA was: "the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment and planning." The way the purpose is stated in this GMP is highly prejudicial against recreational access, in direct violation of the legislation that created the GGNRA and against the promises made by the GGNRA at the time of its creation that traditional recreational uses would be protected and preserved.</p>

207	P	<p>It is not clear how various specific management plans currently under development, including the Marin Equestrian Plan and the Dog Management Plan, will fit into the GMP. Some of the alternatives designate areas at various sites as "natural areas" and "sensitive resources." These designations will preclude recreational access at those sites. Yet some of these same areas are also under consideration for off-leash dog walking and other recreational access under the specific management plans being developed. Will their designation as a "natural area" in the GMP alternative trump their designation as, for example, an off-leash dog walking area in the Dog Management Plan? Which will have precedence -- the GMP or the Dog Management Plan? This uncertainty must be cleared up before any plan is adopted.</p>
207	P	<p>All of the Alternatives are too heavily weighted toward conservation and creating new habitat, rather than conservation and recreation. The legislation that created the GGNRA called for a balance between recreation, conservation, and historical preservation. This balance is lacking in all the alternatives proposed. Although Alternative 1 has a better balance than the others (because it essentially acknowledges that "diverse opportunities" are possible at some sites), it too is weighted too heavily toward creation of new habitat and conservation at the expense of recreational access. Recreation MUST be preserved in the GGNRA.</p>
207	P	<p>Any environmental review must be based on solid, peer-reviewed scientific evidence. Sadly, experience has shown that GGNRA staff biologists often state conclusions about environmental impacts that are not supported by even their own data – for example, the controversy over the oyster farm at Point Reyes and claims about impacts by off-leash dogs on snowy plovers at Ocean Beach (these claims are not supported by the GGNRA's own data which show no correlation between populations of plovers and numbers of off-leash dogs or whether or not dogs are on- or off-leash). A Scientific Code of Conduct/Scientific Code of Ethics is desperately needed when reviewing environmental impact data. Peer-review must be instituted to protect against the "misuse" of science to further "political" environmental decisions.</p>

213	L	<p>Re: Comments on General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement Dear GGNRA Planners:</p> <p>Overall, the open houses and the newsletter is a terrific approach to explaining the scope of the GGNRA, and terrific way to set forth the alternatives.</p> <p>As a general comment, I would like to see a lot more of the park used by everyone. I really believe that you can't truly teach an appreciation of nature, of history and of preservation without physically experiencing it.</p> <p>Riding horses is a tremendous way to experience nature. My interest is in preserving the existing equestrian facilities and enhancing the trail system in Marin and in San Mateo in a way that is in harmony with nature. I ride horses, and my kids ride, and it is an amazingly unique and wonderful way to enjoy nature. The place we ride is Ember Ridge, in Moss Beach (Rancho Corral de Tierra), and it is a remarkably well-managed and accessible place, for people of all socio-economic backgrounds, ages and races.</p> <p>I truly believe, also, that stables can be in harmony with nature, and enhance the park for use by many, many nature enthusiasts. The creek that runs through Ember Ridge has been tested many times and it is my understanding that the water quality remains good. So, with proper management, the stables can have no negative impact while providing a wonderful opportunity for people to enjoy nature.</p>
216	L	<p>On behalf of a group of horse boarders and hikers who keep their horses in the city of Pacifica in San Mateo County, California, I wish to thank you, the National Park Service (NPS) and the Golden Gate National Recreational Area (GGNRA) personnel for this opportunity to add our comments concerning the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Newsletter 4, which addresses the lands of GGNRA. Our comments cover parks we ride or hike regularly. For parks that are not familiar to us, we support the recommendations of the local Horse Councils, Horse Associations, and the Equestrian Trail Riders' Action Committee (ETRAC).</p> <p>We thank GGNRA personnel for reaching out to the equestrian community, encouraging public input and debates as required under the terms of the NPS General Management Policies of 2006. The following embodies the collective comments and suggestions from our group of park users.</p>
216	L	<p>1. GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN. In all of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area (GGNRA) presently owned (and certainly in all future land acquisitions), the parks should be made more accessible to hikers, bicyclists, and horseback riders. Parks were created for the preservation and protection of public open space and for the enjoyment of the public; if the public is not able to enjoy the parks to whatever degree conservancy concerns allow, their support for such open space will flag, and the purchase and preservation of parklands will suffer, harming all future generations. Trails are what make the National Parks accessible to the public; they were originally created both by foot travelers and by those riding horses. Horses and riding have a long history on GGNRA land. We need to preserve and protect this historical use as well as the architecturally significant structures.</p>

216	L	It is important to keep all existing equestrian facilities. These facilities expose the Bay Area community to recreational benefits of horseback riding in the parks. We need these equestrian facilities spread throughout the GGNRA as they also make available much needed horse boarding options for San Francisco Bay Area residents. The existing facilities have a record of financial self-sustainability and represent no financial burden to the County in which they reside but instead vitalize the local economy with equine businesses and services. They are, as well, a source of income for the park service.
216	L	Equestrians are a great asset to land managers: organized local Mounted Patrols help in cases of emergency and participate in Search and Rescue. They patrol the trails and help to maintain them. In time of severe budget cuts, the help of an enthusiastic and committed group of volunteers will make a large contribution to trail maintenance and patrol. Meeting horses on the trails enhances the experience of all the trail users. As an equestrian, I often hear "Oh look, a horse!" People come to the horse to pet him; I feel it enriches their experience as we engage in a conversation with each other.
216	L	For fiscal reasons as well for keeping the natural resources as untouched as possible, new buildings on GGNRA land should be limited. Time and money should be spent on developing and maintaining multi-use trails, establishing five-mile to twenty-five-mile trail loops. Building connecting trails between parks by using existing roads and trails, keeping the trails in their natural state is the most effective way to connect the people with the parks. People visit the parks to enjoy the outdoors on either hikes or rides. A visitor center showing slides about nature occurring outside the visitor center's windows may enhance some visitors' experiences, but cannot provide the irreplaceable, unforgettable human-to-nature connection that helps turn people into conservationists and into nature lovers. Being involved with nature effects that magic. You must help us pass that magic to future generations. Without well-planned trailheads, the land will be difficult to access if not impossible. Trailheads should provide ample parking for all users, picnic tables, bathrooms, water for people and animals, and tying post for horses. Bay Area residents count on the GGNRA staff to keep the access to this open land and to keep alive and active the recreational activity of horseback riding. We vote, we volunteer, we pay our taxes; we need your support for continued and enhanced access to these lands.

216	L	<p>On GGNRA lands currently accessible to horses, equestrians, bicyclists, and hikers have learned to share the trails and care for each other. Equestrians stop to talk to hikers and let dogs and children enjoy their horses; they shut gates carefully, understanding as some hikers and bikers might not know the importance of keeping livestock safe; they can respond to trail emergencies quickly, galloping to obtain aid for an injured hiker or bicyclist on the trail. Bikers courteously warn riders of their approach. Hikers yield the trail, usually smiling and often stopping to chat and admire the horses, ask questions about the area, and inquire about where they can find horses of their own to ride. We educate each other. In all our differences, we learn our commonalities —our connection with the land provides us with connection with each other. Along with preserving species and land, providing a place for this connection is what makes a park or recreation area a national treasure. Horse-boarding facilities and multiuse trails that allow horseback riding are vital to the continuing urban/rural balance in San Mateo. It is this balance, partly, that feeds our economy in diverse ways, keeps us here even when every balance sheet says we could find cheaper land and better housing elsewhere, and attracts the residents and visitors that fight to keep our open spaces preserved and healthy. The sight of a human on a horse connects a tired urban visitor with history and possibilities. With the help of the GGNRA, this sight can continue to be a part of San Mateo County’s human and natural landscape. It is for these reasons we ask you to consider our suggestions below for the use and preservation of our local spaces and trails.</p>
216	L	<p>3. COMMENTS ON THE ALTERNATIVES. Our comments cover parks we ride or hike regularly. For parks that are not familiar to us, we support the recommendations of the local Horse Councils, Horse Associations and the Equestrian Trail Riders’ Action Committee (ETRAC).</p>

217	L	<p>On behalf of the Crissy Field Dog Group, I want to thank you for the opportunity to provide comments for the GGNRA General Management Plan (GMP) Spring 2008 Fourth Newsletter. CFDG has been involved in dog and urban recreation area related issues in the GGNRA since 2000. We advocate responsible dog ownership as well as good environmental stewardship in all areas of the GGNRA. We have a long-term vested interest and view of the GGNRA's planning process and how it addresses and affects all park visitors and their enjoyment and use of this unique urban recreation area.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The summary of the GGNRA GMP planning/EIS process presented in the Spring 2008 Fourth Newsletter indicates the GMP effort is being organized into Management Concepts" and Management Zones" which are applied to each GGNRA unit. In our experience in working through the combined rulemaking/EIS process for dog management in GGNRA, we think a focus on management concepts and on management zones where particular concepts apply, is a useful one. We complement the Park Service on trying to take a wide range of goals and objectives that need to be balanced within the framework of the NPS's and GONRA's missions and the Organic Act, and present them in a public document in a way that tries to focus on different emphases in different locations, appropriate to the values and opportunities of each area of the GGNRA.</p> <p>We therefore hope the Park Service is serious about listening to public comment on these Management Concepts and Management Zones because they need some important, additional refinement, as explained in our comments. As you are aware, the heart (and headquarters) of the GGNRA is located in the City of San Francisco where most park visitors view the GGNRA units as a major urban recreation area. In addition, the outlying GGNRA areas include Mann and San Mateo counties, which are adjacent to major suburban areas.</p> <p>One critical refinement of the Management Concepts is their posing of false choices or alternatives proposals that necessarily polarize people and interested organizations, instead of helping people to give good input to the Park Service on achieving the balance among the uses described on page 2, page 5 and elsewhere, so that a wide range of values are preserved for current and future generations.</p> <p>To be concrete, if you read the Management Concepts, as described on pages 6 and 7, each one involves connecting people with the GGNRA and conserving natural and historical resources for their intrinsic value and so that they are sustained for people to be able to enjoy them.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the Management Concepts, as discussed for most of the GGNRA units and Management Zones, then depart from this integrated view of recreation area management to make the "Alternative I — Connecting People" into a</p>
-----	---	--

217	L	<p>Current Conditions</p> <p>In this regard, the importance of an accurate understanding and statement of current conditions and management cannot be overestimated. The current conditions not only provide an important baseline, but they are important for understanding what the plan proposes to change. Unfortunately, the GMP omits any mention of the long established recreation uses with dogs, horses, etc., e.g. dog walking is mentioned only in Fort Funston current conditions (p12). We have provided an attachment with a list of sites in all three counties with their current conditions as identified from the recent Negotiated Rulemaking Process for Dog Management that the committee and Park Service worked on together. Also, it would be useful to have the acreage of each site managed by the GGNRA listed in the GMP.</p>
217	L	<p>Another concern is the GGNRA's current trails plans that are forcing recreational users together and eliminating long held social trails. This trails plan will no doubt elevate conflict from different user groups, including bicyclists.</p>

217	L	<p>Structure of the GMP</p> <p>The ability to understand how the plan might change raises a more basic question about the GMP. It is simply not possible to understand from the newsletter what the GMP contains and how it is structured. Therefore, it is difficult for the public to provide meaningful comment on a preliminary plan alternative without knowing, if you will, “what a GMP looks like.” This is not explained anywhere in the document.</p> <p>As noted above, the “Preliminary Alternatives” are composed of Management Concepts that are too polarizing and management zones that are too exclusive. One can expect the GMP/EIS “Preferred Alternative” will be a “combination” of the Management Concepts and Management Zones at any given GGNRA unit. This raises a question of whether the current preliminary alternatives are realistic, as NEPA’s purposes is not to invent ‘straw’ alternatives. Still, that still does not explain the structure of the plan.</p> <p>We have been told by GGNRA staff that the current GMP is old and dated, and that the real GMP is a ‘compendium’ of amendments, policies, regulations that have been adopted since the prior GMP. If that is the case, it would be important for the public to be able to see this current GMP compendium. When a preferred alternative is developed, it is essential for full disclosure and for the ability to comment meaningfully, for the planning materials to explain what is proposed to change. For example, it is not clear which existing plans remain in place and which new plans are being prepared in addition to the GMP (eg Crissy Field Environmental Assessment (EA)). Will the existing Crissy Field EA plan remain in place or be “updated” and be incorporated into the GGNRA GMP? How will the other ongoing plan as identified on p3 (such as the Marin Headlands and Ft. Baker Transportation and Infrastructure Management Plan) be incorporated into the GMP?</p> <p>Perhaps the GMP is a series of goal statements, or policy statements, or maps. Perhaps the GMP is a broad-scale set of ‘subarea’ plans, one for each main GGNRA unit, which show focus areas or exclusive use areas, or areas where future plans will be prepared. Perhaps the GMP is augmented by later plans or regulations. It just isn’t clear what the GMP is, and how it relates to other GGNRA policies, rules, plans, programs, or projects. Without this understanding, it is exceedingly difficult to comment on the content and level of detail of the plan. Equally important, it is difficult to know how the GMP governs later GGNRA decisions, and whether or how that the public will be involved in these later GGNRA decisions.</p>
-----	---	---

217	L	<p>Prejudging Decisions</p> <p>We have a particular concern about the relationship between the GMP, the Dog Management Plan/Rule/EIS in general, and the Crissy Field Plan/EA in particular.</p> <p>It is not clear where dog management fits in — either it is separate and supersedes the GMP (unlikely, at least over time), or there will be a view that it must be consistent with the GMP policies — in which case it is not separate, because this plan will set the parameters and boundaries for the dog management plan, which should be disclosed.</p> <p>The timing of both plan EIS processes cannot be predicted with certainty — either one might be completed before the other. It is our understanding, not clear in the GGNRA Spring newsletter, that the dog management plan/rule will govern human recreation with off leash dogs in the GGNRA. However, given the polarized nature of the alternatives as presented (see above comments), a GMP that establishes certain policies or zones could well be carried out in a way that either prejudices the dog management plan (if that is not completed first) and/or skews the implementation of the dog management plan in the future, as the plan will doubtless include an adaptive management component to allow for experience. NEPA plainly prohibits an agency from limiting the choice of reasonable alternatives until the EIS process is completed (40 CFR 1506.1). The preliminary plans, management concepts, and management zones, as presented would — if taken into account at this stage appear to prejudice the development of the dog management plan/rule, The GMP needs to address more clearly how “functional” or “area” plans fit into the GMP and its subsequent interpretation and implementation so as not to limit the choice of reasonable alternatives in these parallel or associated planning efforts.</p>
217	L	<p>Tiering</p> <p>Given the likely generality of the GMP and the need for many implementing actions, the intended use of tiering is not clear: how the GGRNA will go from the GMP to later plans, policies, regulations, programs, or projects and their associated environmental review? It would be very helpful to have a table that illustrates this, perhaps with examples.</p>

217	L	<p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>In closing, we are supportive of the effort to develop good Management Concepts and applying them to Management Zones, as a planning tool to develop the GMP. We ask that you take a “hard look” at how these are currently characterized, because we believe they are not consistent with the Guiding Principles (on page 5), and do not do justice to the intent of the concepts (on pages 6-7) to focus on particular resources while providing a range of visitor experiences and natural and historic resource conservation.</p> <p>In short, it’s not people (or even people and dogs or horses) versus the environment, or recreation versus nature. Sustainability is well-stated, in NEPA’s words, as “productive harmony” between people and nature; trusteeship; achieving “a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life’s amenities;” and to “preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety of individual choice.” We would encourage you to review the framing and evaluation of alternatives in the EIS in light of the national environmental policy stated in Section 101 of NEPA and to bring a more realistic, non- polarizing, integrated approach to the preliminary alternatives.</p> <p>Finally, we ask that you clarify the structure and components of the GMP, how these relate to existing plans and future plans, how the GMP relates to implementing actions (and what are these types of actions), and how you plan to tier from the GMP to subsequent actions. Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the GGNRA GMP Spring 2008 newsletter.</p>
-----	---	--

218	L	<p>The Marin Audubon Society appreciates the opportunity to comment on the GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (GGNRA) currently being considered for revision. We are a 50©)(3) organization whose mission is to protect wildlife and their habitat. We have a long history of support for and working with GGNRA advocating protection of its unique natural resources. Our general comments are below and we have enclosed specific comments on sites in Marin County, the Muir Woods National Monument and, because of its importance as a breeding colony for seabirds, Alcatraz Island. Our interest is in preserving GGNRA’s wildlife and habitats while encouraging enjoyment and use by people that does not adversely impact native ecosystems, habitats and wildlife. These extensive and diverse habitats are the basis of a healthy environment for people and for wildlife. We support reconnecting fragments that have been isolated, ensuring movement corridors for wildlife, minimizing or avoiding the impact of invasive species, and focusing on protecting native ecosystems. In the overall, Mann Audubon Society supports Alternative 2 because it is generally the most protective of natural resources. We welcome a continued opportunity to partner with the Park to protect its natural resources. We recommend that the Park’s sensitive lands be protected and enhance for its sensitive, rare, threatened and endangered species, and for all of the other native species that depend on the Park’s habitats as well.</p> <p>Protection of the natural environment and unique natural resources should be emphasized over cultural resources. We have no problem with maintaining and sustaining existing legacies of human occupation, such as the lighthouses, defense structures, historic buildings, and archaeological site but this should not be at the expense of the natural environment. GGNRA should have the goal of protecting our natural heritage and our natural heritage is our native ecosystems. There is no need to give people “something to do.” Being out in natural habitats should be a goal in itself.</p>
218	L	<p>Concerning the description of Alternative 1, we are interested in protecting and enhancing the “landscapes” but we view them as habitats for wildlife and people. These habitats, and the wildlife that depend on them, must be respected, recognized as important resources and protected. The spectacular diversity and uniqueness of the GGNRA environment is the experience that people should have.</p> <p>More development in the form of new buildings and extensive new trails is not needed. Modest signage to welcome visitors, provide directions, use of existing historic buildings, and low-key interpretive information encouraging people to experience the natural environment is most appropriate. If the emphasis is placed on the resources, the experience people have will take care of itself.</p>

218	L	Regarding the description of Alternative 3, we see no need to “highlight” the facilities mentioned, the Golden Gate, Highway 1, Army buildings etc. They are impressive facilities and make their own statement. Scenic and historic facilities and places should be recognized and explained, but there is no need to dwell on them. Only to tell people their story. It is time to ensure our natural resources are protected, and recognized as an essential part of our heritage.
219	L	5. Trailhead Development: We do not support any proposal for intensified development of trailheads with new facilities such as parking lots, restrooms or picnic areas. The wild, undeveloped appearance of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is what makes it so spectacular.
219	L	6. interagency Coordination: We strongly support the efforts at improved coordination with neighboring agencies and organizations to better manage the park for environmental restoration, protection of species diversity, and building resiliency to climate change.
219	L	8. Miscellaneous: Lastly, we urge consideration of Shirley Souza Nygren’s request for a name change of Santos Meadows to Souza Meadows, and we urge the Park Service to work cooperatively with Bob Winklemann to resolve trail connections and pedestrian safety issues.

220	L	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>The Marin County Bicycle Coalition (MCBC) thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the General Management Plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. MCBC is a ten-year old member-based bicycle advocacy organization with over 1,000 members. We promote safe bicycling for everyday transportation and recreation. Since Marin County one of only four federal pilot communities in the United States related to advancing non-motorized transportation, MCBC is always looking for opportunities to ensure that bicycle and pedestrian improvements can be made into models Advisory Board for other communities nationwide.</p> <p>MCBC attended the June 10 Open House at the San Francisco Bay Model Visitor Center related to the GGNRA General Management Plan. Our comments are based on information received at that meeting as well as Newsletter #4, published by the National Park Service.</p> <p>As part of the General Management Plan (“The Plan”), MCBC wants to ensure that the following elements are included and supported in the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improving bicycle access and safety for all users — both on-road and off-road (including plans for on-road facilities such as bicycle lanes, shared use markings, separated pathways, signage, and bicycle parking),• Expanding opportunities for creating loops within the Park for both transportation and recreation,• Creating connections between communities whenever possible
-----	---	---

220	L	<p>Promoting Safe Bicycling for Everyday Transportation and Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting non-motorized transportation within the Park as a means to reduce our carbon footprint and reliance on fossil fuels while providing a healthy way to experience the Park, • Promoting non-motorized transportation to the Park as a means to reduce our carbon footprint and reliance on fossil fuels while providing healthy access to the Park, • Studying projects and methods that promote non-motorized transportation with the intent of having as little environmental impact as possible.
221	L	<p>It should be emphasized that safety of trail users is important to all and especially to equestrians who are deeply concerned about the well-being of our mounts. To that end, it is vital that mountain bicycles be restricted from footpaths because of the safety hazards they present by their high speed and limited range of rider awareness, i.e., they only look at the ground directly in front of them. The celebrated lawsuit of 1994 (No. C-93-0009, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California) which the local mountain bicyclists and IMBA brought for more trail access (and lost on all counts) against the Secretary of the Interior, the National Park Service and GGNRA settled several issues. One issue was that evidence showed conclusively that mountain bikes on narrow trails do cause conflict among users, and another, that bicyclists have no inherent right to use their vehicles on trails. This landmark case confirmed the values of safety and peaceful enjoyment of wilderness without users being put at risk by speeding bicyclists. The slower pace of hikers and horses is in harmony with nature, wildlife, and with each other. Based on long experience, I urge that the NPS should continue to limit access of mountain bicyclists to wide vehicular-width fire roads (except in Wilderness areas).</p> <p>In closing: I support the position papers submitted by the Mann Horse Council and Sandy Greenbiat, the papers submitted by Ocean Riders of Golden Gate Dairy Stables, and the position papers submitted for San Mateo County issues by the Equestrian Trail Riders Action Coalition and the Coastside Horse Council.</p>
223	L	<p>In planning the future GGNRA vision for equestrian uses, I hope the NPS will ensure the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EQUESTRIAN FACILITIES: Please ensure all of the horse facilities are preserved and remain with no reduction of horses. These stables should continue providing the public with horse-boarding, riding lessons, trail riding and other outreach opportunities.

223	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRAILS & SAFETY: Please improve & expand the trail systems (including more trail loops) to help distribute the increase of park users. Create trail systems to safely provide for hikers and equestrians. Single-track trails with limited sight lines, or inclines, can be unsafe as they expose hikers and equestrians to safety risks from mountain bikes. Wide roads/trails, without steep inclines or limited visibility, are ideal for all user-groups to share.
223	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRAILHEADS: Please allow for separate and adequate parking for horse trailers when planning the development of parking areas. Trailheads should include room to safely unload horses, mounting blocks, tie areas, picnic tables and access to water.
224	L	<p>Stinson Beach Village Association, in Mann County would like to thank you for this opportunity to review and comment on the Management Plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area(GGNRA) Our residence membership organization have attended your Open House events in Fort Mason and Sausalito, with the focus to review the alternatives outlined in the NPS Spring newsletter(2008), and after collectively meeting this month, drafted the comments below for your preview.</p> <p>Within the framework of your management newsletter, we have overwhelmingly endorsed the Concept#1: Connecting people to the Parks, "Park management would focus on ways to attract and welcome people, connect people with the recourses, and promote understanding, enjoyment, preservation and health."We have realized since the conception of the GGNRA to the 'Park next Door' means that the "recreational" options are unique to these urban areas and that whatever final combinations are put forward that</p> <p>'PARKS TO THE PEOPLE' MUST PREVAIL.</p>
227	L	<p>I am responding to the alternatives that are proposed for the new general pan for the parks. I am an equestrian and I support the majority of the concepts in Alternative 1, however Alternative 1 does not apply to all the areas. The final plan should take into account the need to retain existing stables, provide more trails (especially a variety of different length loop trails) and regional connections, provide adequate rig parking for equestrians, identify water sources for livestock, and provide unpaved trail surfaces for both joggers, bicyclists and horses. I also support multi-use trails, with the exception of the trails in the Phleger Estate. Creation of volunteer trail patrols is vital to provide "eyes and ears" in the new property.</p>
231	L	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None of the prelim alternatives are acceptable. However, the lesser evil is Alt. 1/concept 1: connecting people within parks. 2. Element missing: off leash dog walking!!!! This is the most popular recreational activity at many GGNRA locations. Why are you not honoring the understanding that this would not be eliminated when the land was deeded to you? 3. I am so tired and weary of having to write these types of letters to save what you are trying to take away and destroy. We live in a densely populated urban area, not a wilderness. In this environment, recreation should rightfully trump sensitive habitat. Step back and be reasonable for a change.

233	L	<p>Re: (1) Support for preservation of equestrian facilities: Ember Ridge, Picardo Ranch (Millwood), Moss Beach Ranch, Renegade Ranch, Ocean View Stables, Presidio Riding Club, Miwok Stables and Golden Gate Dairy.</p> <p>(2) Support for continued equestrian access to riding trails: Milagra Ridge, Shelldance Nursery area, Sweeney Ridge, Cattle Hill, Mon Point, Pedro Point, Devil's Slide, San Pedro Mountain, Rancho Corral de Tierra, SFPUC Watershed easements (all south of San Francisco), as well as trails in Marin County and San Francisco that are located on GGNRA lands.</p> <p>Why we want to keep stables and trails on the GGNRA park lands (kids' comments):</p>
234	L	<p>From: Supporters of horseback riding in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area</p> <p>Re: (1) Support for preservation of equestrian facilities: Ember Ridge, Picardo Ranch (Millwood), SFPUC Watershed easements, Moss Beach Ranch, Ocean View Stables, Renegade Ranch, Presidio Riding Club, Miwok Stables and Golden Gate Dairy.</p> <p>(2) Support for continued equestrian access to riding trails: Milagra Ridge, Shelldance Nursery area, Sweeney Ridge, Cattle Hill, Mori Point, Pedro Point, Devil's Slide, San Pedro Mountain (all south of San Francisco), Phleger Estate as well as trails in Marin County and in San Francisco that are located on GGNRA lands.</p>

234	L	<p>We the undersigned seek to preserve the existing equestrian facilities and trail access which may in the future be affected by decisions taken by your General Management Planning Team — GGNRA. The above-named stables have successfully operated for decades in our local areas. These facilities are well known and highly utilized. Most are at or near full capacity, confirming the enduring popularity of horseback riding and the continuing urgent need for horse boarding facilities in these coastal areas. Our stables enjoy wide public support and aid many sectors of the local economy (hay and grain production, feed stores, tack stores, online providers, veterinarians, farriers, instructors, rodeos, shows, restaurants, etc.). All of these interests would suffer if riding or horse boarding opportunities were reduced.</p> <p>As urban areas encroach on rural preserves, it becomes all the more important that the government recognize that before the advent of GGNRA our equine facilities were already responsible and established custodians of these lands. The trails have been cared for; they are not degraded. Precautions have been taken not to pollute the seasonal streams. Buildings have been kept to a minimum. Dirt bikes and off-road vehicles that would destroy the natural habitat have been discouraged in an effort to preserve the areas. We continue to be good stewards of the land.</p>
234	L	<p>With the continued high level of interest in horseback riding, horse camps for children, hourly lessons and horse boarding, it is only reasonable that the local facilities be allowed to continue operating in our coastal areas. Urban residents enjoy these traditional pastimes and value the proximity of our stables to the cities. As construction encroaches on open spaces it becomes more difficult to maintain equestrian facilities. Nevertheless, riding remains very popular and we the undersigned need and support our equestrian facilities in the planned Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Thank you for your attention to our petition and please find attached signatures supporting the continuance and enhancement of our equestrian facilities under your management.</p>

235	L	<p>Re: Preservation of Equestrian Facilities in GGNRA</p> <p>(1) Support for preservation of equestrian facilities: Ember Ridge, Picardo Ranch (Millwood), SFPUC Watershed easements, Moss Beach Ranch, Ocean View Stables, Renegade Ranch, Presidio Riding Club, Miwok Stables and Golden Gate Dairy.</p> <p>(2) Support for continued equestrian access to riding trails: Milagra Ridge, Shelldance Nursery area, Sweeney Ridge, Cattle Hill, Mori Point, Pedro Point, Devil's Slide, San Pedro Mountain (all south of San Francisco), Phleger Estate as well as trails in Marin County and in San Francisco that are located on GGNRA lands.</p> <p>Dear Mr. O'Neill,</p> <p>I am writing to request that the GGNRA preserve existing equestrian facilities and trail access referenced above. I have been living and riding horses in the Bay Area for over 20 years now. My 10 year old daughter is just now old enough to begin trail riding in these areas. We were planning to go on a horse camping trip into the Sierra next weekend but due to the high cost of fuel we are changing our plans and will ride and camp on local trails instead. In this era of greater eco-consciousness and conservation it is critical that trails and equestrian facilities remain accessible to those who live in the Bay Area. Horses and horseback riding play an important role in keeping the Bay Area in touch with our environment. Please keep in mind that the decisions you make will impact generations to come and this unique way for them to appreciate the beauty of the Bay Area and encourage its protection.</p> <p>Thank you for supporting the continuance and enhancement of our equestrian facilities under your management.</p>
-----	---	---

<p>236</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>Preservation of Equestrian Facilities in GGNRA From: Friends, boarders and management of San Francisco Horsemen’s Association Ranch Re: (1) Support for preservation of equestrian facilities: Ember Ridge, Picardo Ranch (Millwood), SFPUC Watershed easements, Moss Beach Ranch, Ocean View Stables, Renegade Ranch, Rancho Tierra del Coral, Presidio Riding Club, Miwok Stables and Golden Gate Dairy. (2) Support for continued equestrian access to riding trails: Milagra Ridge, Shelldance Nursery area, Sweeny Ridge, Cattle Hill, Mori Point, Pedro Point, Devil's Slide, San Pedro Mountain (all south of San Francisco), as well as trails in Marin County and San Francisco that are located on GGNRA lands. We the undersigned seek to preserve the existing equestrian facilities and trail access which may in the future be affected by decisions taken by your General Management Planning Team - GGNRA. The above-named stables have successfully operated for decades in our local areas. These facilities are well known and highly utilized. Most are at or near full capacity, confirming the enduring popularity of horseback riding and the continuing urgent need for horse boarding facilities in these coastal areas. Our stables enjoy wide public support and aid many sectors of the local economy (hay and grain production, feed stores, tack stores, online providers, veterinarians, farriers, instructors, rodeos, shows, restaurants, etc.). All of these interests would suffer if riding or horse boarding opportunities were reduced. As urban areas encroach on rural preserves, it becomes all the more important that the government recognizes that before the advent of GGNRA our equine facilities were already responsible and established custodians of these lands. The trails have been cared for; they are not degraded. Precautions have been taken not to pollute the seasonal streams. Buildings have been kept to a minimum. Dirt bikes and off-road vehicles that would destroy the natural habitat have been discouraged in an effort to preserve the areas. We continue to be good stewards of the land. With the continued high level of interest in horseback riding, horse camps for children,</p>
------------	----------	--

237	L	<p>Re: (1) Support for preservation of equestrian facilities: Ember Ridge, Picardo Ranch (Millwood), SFPUC Watershed easements, Moss Beach Ranch, Ocean View Stables, Renegade Ranch, Rancho Tierra del Coral, Presidio Riding Club, Miwok Stables and Golden Gate Dairy.</p> <p>(2) Support for continued equestrian access to riding trails: Milagra Ridge, Shelldance Nursery area, Sweeny Ridge, Cattle Hill, Mori Point, Pedro Point, Devil's Slide, San Pedro Mountain (all south of San Francisco), as well as trails in Marin County and San Francisco that are located on GGNRA lands.</p> <p>We the undersigned seek to preserve the existing equestrian facilities and trail access which may in the future be affected by decisions taken by your General Management Planning Team - GGNRA. The above-named stables have successfully operated for decades in our local areas. These facilities are well known and highly utilized. Most are at or near full capacity, confirming the enduring popularity of horseback riding and the continuing urgent need for horse boarding facilities in these coastal areas. Our stables enjoy wide public support and aid many sectors of the local economy (hay and grain production, feed stores, tack stores, online providers, veterinarians, farriers, instructors, rodeos, shows, restaurants, etc.). All of these interests would suffer if riding or horse boarding opportunities were reduced.</p> <p>As urban areas encroach on rural preserves, it becomes all the more important that the government recognize that before the advent of GGNRA our equine facilities were already responsible and established custodians of these lands. The trails have been cared for; they are not degraded. Precautions have been taken not to pollute the seasonal streams. Buildings have been kept to a minimum. Dirt bikes and off-road vehicles that would destroy the natural habitat have been discouraged in an effort to preserve the areas. We continue to be good stewards of the land.</p> <p>With the continued high level of interest in horseback riding, horse camps for children, hourly lessons and horse boarding, it is only reasonable that the local facilities be allowed to</p>
-----	---	--

<p>238</p>	<p>L</p> <p>Preservation of Equestrian Facilities in GGNRA To: Brian O'Neill, Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area From: Friends, boarders and management of San Francisco Horsemen's Association Ranch</p> <p>Re: (1) Support for preservation of equestrian facilities: Ember Ridge, Picardo Ranch (Millwood), SFPUC Watershed easements, Moss Beach Ranch, Ocean View Stables, Renegade Ranch, Rancho Tierra del Coral, Presidio Riding Club, Miwok Stables and Golden Gate Dairy. (2) Support for continued equestrian access to riding trails: Milagra Ridge, Shelldance Nursery area, Sweeny Ridge, Cattle Hill, Mori Point, Pedro Point, Devil's Slide, San Pedro Mountain (all south of San Francisco), as well as trails in Marin County and San Francisco that are located on GGNRA lands.</p> <p>We the undersigned seek to preserve the existing equestrian facilities and trail access which may in the future be affected by decisions taken by your General Management Planning Team - GGNRA. The above-named stables have successfully operated for decades in our local areas. These facilities are well known and highly utilized. Most are at or near full capacity, confirming the enduring popularity of horseback riding and the continuing urgent need for horse boarding facilities in these coastal areas. Our stables enjoy wide public support and aid many sectors of the local economy (hay and grain production, feed stores, tack stores, online providers, veterinarians, farriers, instructors, rodeos, shows, restaurants, etc.). All of these interests would suffer if riding or horse boarding opportunities were reduced.</p> <p>As urban areas encroach on rural preserves, it becomes all the more important that the government recognizes that before the advent of GGNRA our equine facilities were already responsible and established custodians of these lands. The trails have been cared for; they are not degraded. Precautions have been taken not to pollute the seasonal streams. Buildings have been kept to a minimum. Dirt bikes and off-road vehicles that would destroy the natural habitat</p>
------------	---

240	L	<p>CONCEPTPAPER Golden Gate National Recreation Area Living Indian Museum System Through Civic Engagement Jose Rivera, Ranger Alcatraz IslandINPS</p> <p>- Civic Engagement, a Native Perspective: Ancient Greece is not the only place in which democracy was practiced and refined. What gave birth to the idea that the separate colonies could unite for their mutual benefit? One only has to look to their back yard, the Americas. The Irokwa (Iroquois) Confederacy originally united five nations (tribes), later to incorporate a sixth to become known as the Six Nations. During the time of French encroachment, in 1742 an Irokwa Sachem (chief) named Canassatego answered a request to meet with Pennsylvanian officials, to discuss a "League of Friendship." Later in 1744 at Lancaster, Pennsylvania Canassatego offered a bold new idea to the colonialist, Our wise forefathers established Union artd Amity between the Five Nations. This made us formidable; this has given us great Weight and Authority with our neighboring Nations. We are a powerful Confederacy; and by your observing the same methods, our wise forefathers have taken, you will acquire such Strength and power. Therefore what ever befalls you, never fall out with one another. This bold new idea was debated within the colonies, not only against French encroachment, but against British tyranny was well. Influence of the Irokwa Great Law and their united confederacy was gaining popularity among the colonialists. The Irokwa influence was gaining so much ground that the royal governor, George Clinton of New York, complained that the democratic leaders of the colonies"...were ignorant, illiterate</p>
-----	---	---

240	L	<p>The Living Indian Museum: The Living Indian Museum celebrates "Living Indian Cultures" and embraces the culture as a whole, not just the "artifacts." Through Civic Engagement the Golden Gate National Recreation Area would work directly with Tribal and Community Museums to enable them to "Tell Their Own Story." The Living Indian Museum concept is an enlighten museum approach that accomplishes many positive things: address and counter 'institutional paternalism,' contributes to 'Indian cultural preservation' by empowering the Native communities to tell their own story, while providing the visiting public with a superior first hand educational experience.</p> <p>- Telling Their Own Story: The GGNRA through Civic Engagement would enable Native communities to "Tell Their Own Story" by providing them with a space and expertise, thus creating a Living Museum. GGNRA could suggest a thematic architecture, but ultimately it is up to the Tribe to determine what subject matter and techniques they need to tell their story. Suggested themes could be: 1) Our Ancestors: Pre-Contact, 2) The Dark Cloud: Contact with Europe, 3) Survival and Adaptation, 4) We Are Still Here: The Living Culture. Tribes may choose any combination of themes, or select a single theme. The Tribe could use any combination of techniques to share their story such as storytellers, living history demonstrations, hands on replicas, interpretive panels, real artifacts, audio-visuals or computers.</p>
-----	---	---

<p>240</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>A Living Indian Museum System: There needs to be more than one Living Indian Museum at the GGNRA due to the diverse nature of the Native Bay Area, California and American Indian cultures; plus the profound significance Alcatraz Island has in the Indian world. The Living Indian Museum system would consist of two facilities (Alcatraz & California Indian Living Museum), with one facility containing two sites. Each site would have multiple gallery areas to accommodate more than one exhibit at anyone time. With the multiple gallery concept, it provides a chance for many Native communities to "Tell Their Own Story." One facility, the Alcatraz Island Intertribal Living Museum would have a broader cultural brush stroke, analogues to the National Museum of the American Indian. The California Indian facility would have two sites. One site would be located in the Crissy Field area dedicated to the South Bay CostanoanJOWone people, and provide public transportation access to cultural programming. The second site would be at Fort Baker dedicated to the North Bay Coastal Miwok people. These three Living Indian Museums would meet many of the needs the California Indian people and the general American Indian community has been asking for in a "community orientated museum." Civic Engagement is the key to the Living Indian Museum's success; and a long-term relationship with the Native communities is vital. Each Living Indian Museum (Alcatraz, Crissy Field, Fort Baker) would have slightly different goals, but with the same mission - celebrate and understand the living American Indian cultures. There are various 'multiple-museum systems' models to draw upon such as the Museum of New Mexico, which is in fact a consortium of museums. There is the National Museum of the American Indian with its four-museum concept: the main gallery on the National Mall, the Storage & Conservation facility, the Heye collection in New York and a Traveling museum.</p>
<p>240</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>There is no need for GGNRA to develop a collection for the Living Indian Museums because there are many collections at hand. Examples are, the GGNRA Living Indian Museum system can become an affiliate to the Smithsonian and the National Museum of the American Indian, Tribal and Community Indian Museums, the Hearst Museum of Anthropology at UC Berkeley, and a large portion of the California State Indian collections is not from California. Therefore, if the Tribal exhibit needs an artifact, there are many of places for the Living MuseumIGGNRA to draw from.</p>

<p>240</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>The California Indian Living Museum (CILM). The CILM is a 'two-sites' facility to highlight the diverse Bay Area cultures. Each CILM site would have multiple gallery areas. The main gallery area at each site would be dedicated to the local people Miwok, or Costanoan/OWone people. A second gallery area would be dedicated to all California Indian people on a rotating basis. A third gallery area would be open for traveling exhibits, or other American Indian tribal people to use.</p> <p>There is about thirty years worth of testimony, reports and community meetings with the California Indian community by California State Parks, dealing with the need for a new California Indian Museum. A consistent and repeated theme statewide from the California Indian community is a distain for a large tourist style museum that attempts to "interpret" the diverse California cultures in one facility. The Native people do not want a museum that treats Indian culture like artifacts; dead and extinct. The State Parks Native American Task Force in 1977 envisioned the, " ... State Indian Museum would not be a single entity but would, in a sense, constitute a hub oaf wheel with at least six radiating spokes [Regional Indian Museums] (State Parks, 1977: 6)." The GGNRA can become the "hub" of a new California Indian Museum cultural wheel.</p> <p>The CILM is a way for the GGNRA to meet the stated needs of the California Indian community, contribute directly to cultural preservation and provide the park visitor with a unique view of California Indian culture. The CILM is a unique and fresh museum approach, and will not conflict or duplicate the work presently being done by California State Parks, but it would complement it. Perhaps through Civic Engagement, GGNRA and California State Parks could work together with the California Indian community to create a comprehensive California Indian Museum System.</p> <p>The California Indian community has consistently advocated a "Regional Indian Museum" approach. The Regional Indian Museum approach makes the institution more accessible and alive to the diverse California Indian communities statewide. The 1977 Native American Task Force recommended,</p>
------------	----------	---

240	L	<p>There is no need for the NPS and the GGNRA to create any "Regional Indian Museums," only organize the California Indian Tribal and Community Museums into a consortium through Civic Engagement. The Tribal Museums in effect becomes the GGNRA's Regional Indian Museum system. Thirty years ago the Indian community was reliant upon the State of California's resources to develop a new State Indian Museum. At the present time the situation has reversed, many California Tribes now have the resources to develop their own Tribal Museums. A consortium of California Tribal and Community museums would be the "real grass-roots" California Indian Museum.</p>
240	L	<p>Final Thoughts: This proposal is the ideal, in terms of its development. It would be ideal if each spoke of the Living Indian Museum System (Alcatraz, Crissy Field, Fort Baker) be developed at the same time, each with the necessary resources and staff. However, the beauty of this proposal and a Regional Indian Museum approach is, they can work in tandem as well as independently. Each Museum spoke may have its own evolution. One spoke may have a faster building period, another may excel in community outreach, while another in naturalistic interpretive programs. Each site in its own organic evolutionary development.</p> <p>If the Civic Engagement efforts are successful, the California Indian and general American Indian community will feel that this is "their museum." Per the basic precepts of Civic Engagement it is vital that the Indian Community be full-fledged partners from the inception.</p> <p>"Ishim looked upon us as sophisticated children, smart but not wise. In we know many things, but much of it is false. But, he knew nature which was always true." A.L. Kroeber, describing Ishim's thoughts.</p>
246	E	<p>The GGNRA was brought into the National Park System because of it's unique location and character. Undermining it's special quality by eroding the cultural resources is a crude and short sighted management plan.</p>

249	L	<p>GFNMS has an entire program dedicated to the protection of seabirds, The Seabird Colony Protection Program, which began in 2006. This Program specifically aims to reduce human disturbance to seabirds at coastal breeding and roosting sites in Central California in order to improve the survival and recruitment of seabirds by targeting the three main sources of these disturbances: boats, planes and humans on foot. Annual funding for education and outreach is provided, and this is also a partnership program with state and federal agencies, including National Park Service. GFNMS welcomes an ongoing partnership for seabird protection. The program tracks disturbances through monitoring. Monitoring data has shown that both motorized and non-motorized vessels can cause a disruption to breeding activities, and that boats have caused the most severe observed impacts to seabird colonies by approaching in close proximity. According to a report released in 1998 by H.R. Carter et al., seabird population responses to preventing disturbances by boats could include increased breeding successes, population size and roosting use. These benefits to seabird populations would help compensate for injuries to seabirds from oils spills and other anthropogenic causes by speeding and ensuring natural population recovery in the near future.</p>
249	L	<p>GFNMS also has a Seabird Technical Advisory Committee, composed state and federal agencies including GGNRA, which advises us on actions to protect and restore seabirds. The Committee advised us to recommend vessel "no-go" zones around the ten key seabird breeding and roosting colonies and provided a 1000 ft closure distance recommendation. These actions would eliminate 91% of disturbance and 95% of flushing (causing birds to fly), according to U.S. Fish and Wildlife monitoring data. One of the ten locations was Bird Rock off Point Bonita. This recommendation specifically includes non-motorized vessels. Therefore, we urge GGNRA to consider this recommendation when determining how to code this area on the map. The other "Sensitive Resource" zone on the map is the area between Rocky Point and Muir Beach. It would be helpful to describe the specific reasons for listing this zone for special protection (i.e intertidal collection, offshore fishing, motorized vessels).</p>
249	L	<p>Other Planning Topics</p> <p>Climate Change: GFNMS supports the planning approach for addressing climate change. We recommend that the preferred alternative address impacts of climate change for each of the Management Zones and clarify if there are any specific management actions for addressing climate change. We also offer to partner with GGNRA on addressing climate change in coastal areas.</p>

1004	C	Locate the visitor center at the Montara Lighthouse. Plan for connecting to the Coastal trail from Marin to S.F to Pacifica to Montera. To follow up on #2 above, establishing trail connecting from the Marin Headlands across the GG Bridge to lands end, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Mori Pt, Correl de Tierra via Devils Slide (both on that 1, and along the historic San Pedro Rd behind the tunnel is critical).
1005	C	If it works, leave it alone. Reevaluate your priorities to include a "sense of place" a "sense of history." This is what people want to see - not the "psuedo" of Las Vegas and Disneyland. The visitor center born at Bear Valley is lovely but it is not a barn. Reevaluate your priorities to include peoples lives and how to include not exclude them. People are not "structures." In the future anyone visiting Muirwoods should have a pre-purchased ticket as Steep Revine, Eiffel Tower, Alcatraz. This is the future - visitors can arrive via SF tours, shuttles on car park - in the future at 4 corners. Eliminate cars from Muirwoods and put into action pre purchased tickets, with all given number of tickets available for date/time. This is the future an there are many precedents that you can give use as examples. This ghost the Park Service and the world. you cannot continue to allow cars arriving randomly to Muirwoods.
1009	C	There is insufficient concern for safety of the public who use roads and trails on public land. Mountain bike pose an unacceptable risk of harm to move vulnerable user of trailer i.e. hikers and horsemen. The longer established poling that a wheelchair and legs don't mix on single track trail must be preserved. Otherwise, the more aggressive users will drive out the more vulnerable - and much larger segment of the public.
1012	L	After the presentation at the Bay Model I wrote Brian A Aviles, ideas about the GGNRA Management Plan. Especially, I stressed ways to have the GGNRA affordable and available to diverse community populations + experiences similar to environmental and historical program opportunities in other National Parks. I stressed that Affordability enabled diversity and that the Park system's programs enrich recreational experience. I mentioned a Pass that could be used, as I have often, my (then free) Golden Eagle Pass and to influence my continuing support of National Parks and Recreation areas. I believe voluntary donations at sites, concession % for parks funding and a pass Special Experience system would achieve as much as fees for parking which are the same as fees for use and are prohibited by Robert Burton's leadership in the GGNRA's creation. I said I would send my Patriot's Pass and finally, have it enclosed. This could be used as a annual PASS for Bay Area residents (with a time constraint, early AM or late afternoon use. A large percentage of visitations I uses is by local residents. Also, I copied the attached (old) Don Olson material, which you might use as a base line for any current GGNRA drainage studies that relate to my favorite plea: Acquire as Mann open space the privately owned parcels in the community of Muir Wood's Park - The community is planning to join SASM; so sewers shall remove the County's present restraint — septic system fields. New impervious roads and large parcels' "big home developments, under 4,000 square feet that meet zoning setbacks, etc per the County wide Plan, and now Title 22, are exempt from Design Review. Any buildings and roads on the trails I paper streets shall adversely impact the Redwood Creek watershed and Muir Woods.

1013	L	<p>I had a bit of trouble navigating through the website, but was finally able to get enough information to give you so feedback about the proposed plan for the Muir Woods, within the context of the General Management Plan. Here a some thoughts:</p> <p>Park Access:</p> <p>I fully support the movement toward an off-site orientation station for visitors at the 1/101 junction, with shuttles available to bring people into the park. Hopefully the shuttles would be electric or solar powered vehicles, or some other zero emissions alternative. I also suggest that people with alternative vehicles (i.e. quiet and zero emission) allowed to park closer to the Woods, much like the City Zip Cars or Car Share system in SF. This shift would enable Park Management to return some of the existing parking areas to meadows or more natural habitats. And of course any way of strengthening the network of bike and walking trails leading to the Woods might also ease the impact c cars.</p> <p>Delicate Balances</p> <p>I support protecting and maintaining the most low-impact trails, while still retaining the “boardwalk” as the primary access point for day visitors, international visitors, and large families with children. This is often the first or only contact many of these user groups have with a National Park, let alone a redwood ecosystem, so I applaud the multiple efforts made at the Muir Woods to invite people into the experience of the natural environment. The Park Service has been extraordinarily successful in preserving a precious balance between access for people, and protection of the natural resources. For example, the boardwalk is an amazing way to give people non-verbal cues about where they can go, without cluttering the landscape with fences, and barriers, all the while protecting the or systems of the nearby flora.</p> <p>Visitor Needs</p> <p>In keeping with the above, I support the provision of minimal amounts of food and drink for visitors. And of course bathrooms. I suggest that interpretive information be incorporated into bathrooms and eating areas to help us (the visitors) understand our impact on the resource, and to encourage us to “tread lightly on the land”. If it is an economic necessity for the park, I suggest that items for purchase should be limited to those with educational or consciousness-raising content, but not items and redwood knick knacks which ultimately contribute to our consumerist waste stream. As an educator, I would like to encourage children to think, feel and actively engage w the natural environment, rather than buying a little piece of it to take home as a trophy.</p> <p>Interpretive Information</p>
------	---	--

1018	L	<p>I am responding to the alternatives that are proposed for the new general plan for the parks. I am an equestrian and I support the majority of the concepts in Alternative 1. However, Alternative 1 does not apply to all the areas. The final plan should take into account the need to retain existing stables, provide more trails (especially a variety of different length loop trails) and regional connections, provide adequate rig parking for equestrians, identify water sources for livestock, and provide unpaved trail surfaces for joggers, bicyclists and horses. I also support multi-use trails, with the exception of the trails in the Phleger Estate. Creation of volunteer trail patrols is vital to provide “eyes and ears” in the new property.</p> <p>In Mann County, California I support the position of the Mann Horse Council and want to go on record as supporting the continued presence of the horse facilities and increase in access to trails. The final plan must address the presence and needs of equestrians.</p> <p>In San Mateo County I support most of the proposals in Alternative 1 for all the properties. The final plan should take into account the diverse nature of the land in San Mateo County and MUST allow for the continued presence of the horse facilities. The areas that have not traditionally been open to equestrians in the GGNRA should be re-examined and those properties opened up where possible. I support the details that ETRAC and the Coastside Horse Council have proposed.</p> <p>I would like to address the issue of the lands in the Rancho Corral de Tierra parcel. This is a new acquisition and must be carefully planned. Horsemen are committed to multi-use in this area. Alternatively, Section 1 should be amended to preserve stables where they are because they provide quality of life for the Coasts idea area and San Mateo County as a whole. This is a large enough area that dogs on leash could be allowed as well.</p>
------	---	--

1019	L	<p>I write to strongly endorse the Concept Paper submitted to the GGNRA that is proposing a "Living Indian Museum System through Civic Engagement." The plan involves the development of several Living Indian Museums within the GGNRA that will provide fantastic opportunities for public education and outreach about local California Indian tribes. What is innovative about the plan is that it will focus on contemporary Indian communities in the greater San Francisco Bay Area. The plan calls for facilities on Alcatraz Island that will incorporate a broader perspective of Indians in California and beyond, and two specific sites that will provide detailed backgrounds and information on local Indian groups. The first site, at Crissy Field in the Presidio of San Francisco, will be dedicated to the Costanoan/Ohione, while the second site at Fort Mason will be concerned primarily with the Coast Miwok. I am very enthusiastic about the overall goals of the plan. The plan provides great flexibility in how the three facilities may be developed in close collaboration with local tribes and other pertinent stakeholders. These facilities will have the potential to be significant centers of public education and outreach about past and contemporary Native lifeways and communities in the greater San Francisco Bay Area. As the proposal emphasizes, there is no reason for these facilities to be extensive artifact holding warehouses, like most traditional museums. There are many opportunities to obtain excellent artifactual materials on long-term and short-term loans from other institutions (Smithsonian, Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, etc.) which can be used to develop truly innovative museum displays at the three facilities.</p> <p>I believe the plan provides a series of realistic steps for developing a Living Indian Museum System in the GGNRA. The key issue will be gaining the support of the local tribes and for them to play critical roles in how the facilities are developed and</p>
139, 122, 174	P	<p>Topic 1: I prefer Alternative 1/Concept 1: Connecting People with Parks, which has a goal of "bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population," and enhancing access, rather than making the park less accessible.</p>
148, 149, 144	P	<p>1. I prefer Alternative 1/Concept1: Connecting People with Parks, which has a goal of bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse population, and enhancing access, rather than making the park less accessible.</p>
205, 204, 158, 141, 201	P	<p>Topic 1: I prefer Alternative 1/Concept 1: Connecting People with Parks, which has a goal of "bringing national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population," and enhancing access rather than making the park less accessible.</p>
205, 204, 158, 141, 201	P	<p>Topic 3:All the alternatives/concepts are too heavily biased toward conservation and/or the creation of sensitive habitats, rather than balancing recreation and conservation. Recreation, including off-leash dog walking, is an important activity which should be preserved and can co-exist with protection of natural resources.</p>

41P	P	Alternative 3 is a reasonable balance between Alternative 1 which calls for too much development, and Alternative 2, which calls for too much removal of existing facilities. The Bay Area is not going to shrink in population, and the number of visitors will likely also continue to increase. Alt. 1 recognizes this need to plan for more visitors. However, I do not think that hotels are appropriate in locations like Alcatraz or Fort Cronkhite, nor cabins at Kirby Beach. Visitors don't come to San Francisco to be stuck out on an island with a bad climate. Facilities should be improved for the broad spectrum of visitors, and not just for the wealthy. Facilities should also aim at a broad range of physical ability, from disabled to marathon runners.
76, 173, 112	P	I am responding to the alternatives that are proposed for the new general plan for the parks. I am an equestrian and I support the majority of the concepts in Alternative 1, however Alternative 1 does not apply to the entire area. The final plan should take into account the need to retain existing stables, provide more trails (especially a variety of different length loop trails) and regional connections, provide adequate trailer parking for equestrians, identify water sources for livestock, and provide unpaved trail surfaces for both joggers, bicyclists and horses.
76, 173, 112	P	I also support multi-use trails, with the exception of the trails in the Phleger Estate. Expansion of volunteer trail patrols is vital to provide "eyes and ears" in the new property - this is already in affect, with at least one existing stable on the property.
97, 93, 106, 107, 99, 87, 94, 140, 81, 96, 151, 95	P	Perfect days to you! I strongly support Alternative 2 for Alcatraz Island, all San Francisco locations in San Francisco County, the SFPUC, and Mori Point in San Mateo County to preserve habitat for birds and other native wildlife for future generations.
97, 93, 106, 107, 99, 87, 94, 140, 81, 96, 151, 95	P	Please do your best to communicate and support our understanding that not only wildlife but all life is best served by lack of access to human food and trash/waste within the GGNRA.