

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

RECORD OF DECISION

FORT BAKER PLAN AND FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORT BAKER
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to §102 (2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Public Law 91-190, as amended, and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1505.2), the Department of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS) has prepared the following Record of Decision on the *Fort Baker Plan* and *Final Environmental Impact Statement* (FEIS).

This document is a concise statement of the decisions that were made, the alternatives considered (including identification of the environmentally preferred alternative), the basis for the decision, and the mitigating measures developed in order to avoid or minimize environmental impacts. It also provides background information on the project and the public involvement process that was used to develop and refine the proposed plan and alternatives.

DECISION

The NPS will amend the *1980 Golden Gate National Recreation Area General Management Plan* as it pertains to Fort Baker in accordance with the Proposed Action Alternative as described and analyzed in the *Fort Baker Plan* and *Final Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS). The Fort Baker Plan Draft EIS was issued in October 1998 for a 60-day public review and comment period, and the Final EIS was released in October 1999. The Final EIS is comprised of two volumes: Volume I (Draft EIS, as amended); and Volume II (Response to Comments).

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Project Purpose

Public Law 92-589 established the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) in order to "...preserve for public use and enjoyment...outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values, and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning..." (16 USC 460bb). According to 16 USC 460bb(2), "...the easterly half of Fort Baker in Marin County, California shall remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. When the property is determined by the Department of Defense to be in excess of its needs, it shall be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary [of the Interior] for purposes of this Act." In 1995, the remaining military land at Fort Baker was determined to be excess to the needs of the military by the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure Committee and was required to be transferred to the National Park Service, consistent with Public Law 92-589, by the year 2001.

The Fort Baker site includes a Historic District listed on the National Register of Historic Places containing 45 contributing features (including post-civil war era coastal fortifications), a marina and waterfront area, and important open space and scenic and natural areas including habitat for the federally listed endangered mission blue butterfly. The National Park Service must provide for the reuse of Fort Baker as a new unit of the National Park System consistent with the requirements of Public Law 92-589 which established the GGNRA, and with the Organic Act of 1916 which established the National Park Service. The Organic Act of 1916, as amended provides the overall mission statement and guiding principle for National Park Service which states that:

"The fundamental purpose of all units of the National Park Service is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife 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."

The National Park Service must also comply with the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act and thoroughly evaluate the effect of projects on historic properties. In keeping with these authorities, Section 1.2 of the Final EIS stated that the purpose of the EIS was to identify:

- The program and types of uses that would be accommodated in historic buildings and generate adequate revenue for building rehabilitation and preservation;
- Improvements to facilitate public uses, including new construction and removal of buildings, landscape treatments, trails, parking, circulation, and locations and patterns of use;
- Waterfront improvements;
- Opportunities for habitat restoration; and
- An approach to the protection, rehabilitation and maintenance of the historic and natural resources.

Public Involvement

Following the 1995 closure announcement, the National Park Service implemented a public planning effort to develop a plan for the future use and preservation of the site and its resources. In December 1995 and January 1996, the National Park Service developed a proposed framework for the planning process. This framework was presented and discussed with local planning agencies and the public, and a formal presentation was made at the January 1996 GGNRA Advisory Commission meeting. Public involvement was integral to the development of the plan, its goals and objectives, and the mitigation measures presented in the Final EIS.

The first step in the public planning process was a scoping process that was initiated through a notice published in the Federal Register on August 19, 1997. A Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on May 4, 1998. The scoping process included an evaluation of the approved 1980 *Golden Gate National Recreation Area General Management Plan* (GMP) and development of goals and objectives for the Fort Baker Plan. The 1980 GMP provides a comprehensive land use plan for the lands within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, including specific reuse concepts for Fort Baker. The 1980 GMP envisioned that Fort Baker would accommodate a variety of uses including a 350-person educational conference center, a 150-person environmental study area, a 200-person hostel, ferry service, a 700- car parking lot to stage shuttle service to the Marin Headlands, and short-term public berthing at the marina. These land uses and programs were reviewed within the context of current site

conditions, and other recreational and educational uses that had been established within the GGNRA since 1980. This evaluation showed that a reduction in the overall intensity of use originally envisioned for Fort Baker was desirable to protect the site's resources, and to avoid duplication or competition with public programs already offered at other places within the park. The 1980 GMP land uses were scaled back, and some uses eliminated, in the development of the Fort Baker Plan (the Proposed Action Alternative evaluated in the EIS). A more detailed description of the 1980 GMP land use concepts is provided below as part of the "Alternatives Considered" discussion. As part of the most recent planning effort, draft goals and objectives for the project were developed with the public, and used to refine and screen various alternatives (see "Basis for Decision" section).

More than 50 public meetings, workshops, site tours, and meetings were held over the course of the planning process. Thousands of public notices, planning updates and public input surveys were sent to the public to further solicit input and maintain active public participation in the development and evaluation of alternatives for the Fort Baker Plan. Many alternatives were developed and considered, and three "action" alternatives were carried forward for additional evaluation in the EIS. The environmental review process provided additional opportunities for public input and involvement through meetings, open houses, presentations, and public review and comment on the Draft EIS. Planning updates and opportunities for public comment were also provided at more than 10 publicly noticed meetings of the GGNRA Advisory Commission during the planning and environmental review process. During the 60-day public review period for the Draft EIS, 127 letters, e-mail messages, and oral comments (at the November 18, 1998 GGNRA Advisory Commission meeting) were received. The National Park Service reviewed and responded to all comments in the Final EIS, which was released on October 15, 1999. Additional analysis of issues of concern and new and/or more refined mitigation measures were developed and included in the Final EIS in response to public review and comment.

An overview of the Final EIS was also presented to the GGNRA Advisory Commission at a public meeting on November 16, 1999. Following release of the Final EIS, the National Park Service received written comments and, at the November 16, 1999 GGNRA Advisory Commission meeting, oral comments were received. (See "Comments Received Following Release of the Final EIS" discussion below.)

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Three action alternatives and a "No Action Alternative" were analyzed in the *Fort Baker Plan Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS). The action alternatives analyzed in the EIS were developed and refined through a three-year public planning and environmental review process and include; the Proposed Action, the 1980 GMP Alternative, and the Office and Cultural Center Alternative. Each alternative is summarized below.

The **Proposed Action** envisions preservation of historic structures and natural features of the site through selection of compatible uses and rehabilitation, restoration and other site improvements. A retreat and conference center would be created in the historic buildings around the parade ground and in the adjacent nonhistoric Capehart area. A program element would be developed to create a distinct identity for the retreat and conference center, and to strengthen the relationship of uses of the center's facilities to National Park purposes and the National Park mission. New compatibly designed construction would provide adequate space for meetings, dining and accommodations.

The Bay Area Discovery Museum would be retained and would expand into historic buildings and new, compatibly designed structures within its campus. The existing Coast Guard Station would also be retained, and could implement a modest expansion for meeting/training space or staff quarters.

The historic boat shop would be used as a public center with meeting and program space, and supporting visitor amenities. The marina would be converted to a public (non-membership-based) facility that accommodates up to 60 boats through a combination of moorings/slips for day or overnight use. Docks would be provided for the Coast Guard to use for mooring of disabled rescued boats, and for other NPS programs.

Restoration or enhancement of more than 40 acres of natural habitat, including habitat for the federally endangered mission blue butterfly would be implemented. The wooden bulkhead along the waterfront would be removed and the beach restored, with an adjoining 6 acres of meadow, a picnic area and boardwalk. Improvements to the fishing pier include the addition of fish-cleaning stations, railings and benches. The batteries and other fortification structures would be stabilized, preserved and interpreted (Battery Cavallo would be subject to a separate plan and environmental analysis). An NPS visitor center would be established and an interpretive trail would be created from Lime Point along the waterfront, continuing as the San Francisco Bay Trail to East Road, Battery Duncan and the chapel.

Other site-wide improvements included under the Proposed Action are:

- Improvements to hiking trails and bicycle routes.
- Rehabilitation of historic landscape features.
- Relocation of roads and parking away from the central waterfront and improvements to circulation routes, with sufficient unobtrusive parking around the site.
- Repair and replacement of utilities with sustainable systems that meet or exceed building and energy efficiency codes.

The 1980 General Management Plan (GMP) for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is the basis for the **GMP Alternative**. This alternative would create a conference center to accommodate 350 people, a 200-bed youth hostel and an artists-in-residence program in the historic buildings around the parade ground. Twenty-three nonhistoric structures in the Capehart area would be removed and replaced with a 700-car parking lot for staging a shuttle to the Marin Headlands, and an NPS maintenance facility would be constructed. The Bay Area Discovery Museum and Coast Guard Station would be retained with no new construction or expansion. The historic boat shop and marina would be used in a similar way to the Proposed Action, with 50 slips provided for short-term public mooring. Treatment of the waterfront would be similar, however, a more urban landscape would be created. The fishing pier would be improved as in the Proposed Action. A ferry landing would be created at the pier. Historic fortifications would be preserved, and an environmental study and overnight campsite established near Battery Cavallo. An NPS visitor center would be established in a historic building, and roads and trails improved.

Under the **Office and Cultural Center Alternative**, the historic Parade Ground buildings would be used for offices, meeting and program space, and performance space and restaurant/food service space for private and nonprofit groups. Some nonhistoric residential structures would be used for park partner residences, and others would be removed to provide parking for the center. The Bay Area Discovery Museum and Coast Guard expansion would be the same as under the Proposed Action. The marina would be retained with both long-term and some short-term public mooring provided and public program and activity space provided in the boat shop. Treatment of

the waterfront, fishing pier, open space, natural habitats and historic fortifications would be the same as under the Proposed Action.

Under the **No Action Alternative**, the residential buildings in the parade ground and Capehart area would be leased or permitted as residences. Nonresidential structures would be stabilized for preservation with no new use. There would be minimal changes to the waterfront to provide for visitor safety, and no expansion of the Bay Area Discovery Museum or Coast Guard Station. The marina would be closed, the slips and docks removed, and the boat shop would be stabilized for preservation with no new use. Minimal preservation treatment of natural and cultural resources would be carried out to meet legislative requirements and to complete restoration efforts currently underway.

ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The environmentally preferred alternative is defined as "...the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in NEPA's Section 101. Ordinarily, this means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative which best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources" (*Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) National Environmental Policy Act Regulations*).

The environmentally preferred alternative is the Proposed Action. Under the Proposed Action, the site's Historic District and character would be preserved, natural resources protected, existing habitat expanded, and the environmental effects associated with its use as a National Park site would be minimized. The EIS analyzed the Proposed Action's maximum environmental impacts, which included new uses and improvements to the site, including development of a 350-room retreat and conference center. Even under this "maximum scenario," the Proposed Action would generate less long-term environmental impact than the other action alternatives and would create the most environmentally beneficial effect overall, as described below. The Final EIS formalized the agency's commitment to solicit the smallest possible, economically feasible retreat and conference center proposal that meets the objectives of the project. However, for the purposes of this discussion, the maximum environmental impacts associated with a 350-room center are compared against the impacts of the other alternatives.

Under the No Action Alternative, minimal repairs to existing historic structures, infrastructure and other facilities would be implemented. Historic residential buildings would be leased for residential use and other historic buildings would remain vacant with minimal repair. No restoration of the cultural landscape or beach and waterfront area would be implemented. In addition, no new habitat restoration or enhancement for the federally endangered mission blue butterfly would be implemented. Although the effects of visitor use (traffic, air emissions, etc.) would be lower under the No Action Alternative, the benefits of the other "action" alternatives associated with habitat restoration, preservation and restoration of historic resources and the cultural landscape, recreational use and enjoyment by the American public, and beneficial visual effects would not occur.

Many of the environmental effects of the three action alternatives would be similar, with varying degrees of intensity. The 1980 General Management Plan (GMP) Alternative would have greater adverse effects on biological resources, recreation and visitor use, traffic and circulation, and air quality and noise than the other action alternatives. In comparison to the Proposed Action, the GMP Alternative would generate higher daily visitation, and daily vehicle trips would represent a 210% increase over the Proposed Action (and would require more than 1,600 parking spaces –

nearly double the amount needed under the Proposed Action). The Office and Cultural Center Alternative includes many of the same components as the Proposed Action, including treatment of the waterfront area, habitat restoration, and trails and open space. As a result, many of the environmental effects would be similar. Although some of the short-term construction effects associated with the Proposed Action would be avoided under the Office and Cultural Center Alternative, the latter would generate higher visitation and generate vehicle trips that would represent a 150% increase over the Proposed Action. As a result, the Office and Cultural Center Alternative would create greater long-term traffic and corresponding air quality and noise effects. The Office and Cultural Center Alternative would also be less preferable given the need for parking expansion (up to 1,300 spaces would be needed in comparison to the Proposed Action's maximum 895 spaces).

The Office and Cultural Center Alternative and the Proposed Action would be similar in their environmental effects, with the Proposed Action being environmentally preferred when considered on the whole. The Proposed Action provides the appropriate balance between protection and rehabilitation of the site's significant cultural and natural resources, and minimizes the long-term environmental effects associated with its use.

BASIS FOR DECISION

The National Park Service will implement the "Proposed Action" identified in the *Fort Baker Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement* issued in October 1999. The United States Department of Defense will transfer the remaining land under military ownership at Fort Baker to the National Park Service in 2001. The intent of the selected action is to transform Fort Baker from a military installation to a new unit of the National Park System through selection of a series of actions consistent with the National Park mission.

During the planning process for the project, the National Park Service, working with the public, established goals and objectives that were used as a framework for evaluating potential new uses and site improvements at Fort Baker. The goals and objectives were developed based on National Park Service policy guidance, the 1980 General Management Plan, public input, current knowledge about the site, and an understanding of Fort Baker's national park qualities. The project objectives are presented in the Purpose and Need (Section 1.3) of the EIS, and address the following goals:

- Promote the National Park Mission
- Achieve Sustainability
- Retain and Relate to the Site's Special Qualities
- Promote Public Access
- Minimize Environmental Impacts
- Retain and Complement Permanent Site Tenants and Other GGNRA Sites and Programs

The basis for the decision to adopt the "Proposed Action" is its ability to successfully fulfill the goals and objectives of the project. The Proposed Action provides the most desirable combination of promoting the National Park mission and public use, while preserving the site's resources and contemplative atmosphere and minimizing environmental effects including traffic.

The selected action will preserve and significantly enhance Fort Baker's cultural, natural, scenic and recreational values and minimize environmental impacts. This is accomplished by the following:

- Preservation of the historic buildings through selection of compatible public uses that have the ability to fund their necessary rehabilitation and long-term preservation and which will preserve the character of the site;
- Rehabilitation of historic landscapes that contribute to the National Register Historic District;
- Control of new construction to assure compatibility with the Historic District, and fit within the capacity of the site;
- Removal of roads and parking from the central waterfront and parking adjacent to the historic parade ground to create a pedestrian-oriented zone and restore the visual connection between these two areas;
- Confining new construction to the existing developed and previously disturbed areas of the site;
- Restoration or enhancement of more than 40 acres of natural habitat, including a beach and 20 acres of habitat for the federally endangered mission blue butterfly;
- Preservation of the site's open space, shoreline and natural habitats which comprise 85% of the site's 335 acres;
- Preservation and enhancement of appropriate public uses including fishing, boating, hiking and scenic viewing;
- Preservation and enhancement of existing park partner programs of the US Coast Guard and Bay Area Discovery Museum, and expansion of the Discovery Museum's program through new construction within its campus;
- Establishment of a program institute to create retreat and conference center programs that relate to the NPS mission;
- Visitor education and involvement through NPS interpretive and stewardship programs, visitor center and interpretative signing and exhibits;
- Incorporation of principles of sustainability in design, construction and operation of the site; and
- Mitigation requirements to avoid or minimize environmental impacts associated with new uses, including the reduction of traffic and the protection of natural and cultural resources.

MEASURES TO MINIMIZE HARM

The National Park Service has identified the known practicable mitigation measures to avoid or minimize the environmental effects of the Proposed Action. In response to public input on the Draft EIS, additional measures were developed and existing mitigation measures were refined to

be more stringent in the Final EIS. One of the new mitigation measures relates to the size of the proposed retreat and conference center component of the Proposed Action. The Final EIS was modified to include a mitigation measure that formalizes the National Park Service commitment to seek the smallest possible, economically feasible retreat and conference center proposal that meets the project objectives. The National Park Service is committed to working towards that goal, and with the public throughout project implementation.

The Proposed Action is anticipated to have minor to moderate effects (direct, indirect and cumulative). An unavoidable adverse effect to the existing military yacht club members, who will be displaced as a result of the conversion of the marina to a public facility, cannot be avoided by the Proposed Action. In total, more than 70 mitigation measures have been identified and are included in the Final EIS. Additional mitigation measures were incorporated into the Final EIS as recommended by the public or other agencies, or were developed by the NPS in response to issues of local concern, and were added in the Final EIS. The full text of the Final EIS mitigation measures (Section 2.6) is hereby incorporated by reference and is appended to this Record of Decision (see **Appendix A**).

Consistent with, and expanding on the mitigation measures described in Appendix A, the National Park Service is committed to looking for and implementing innovative approaches to reduce long-term dependence on automobile use at Fort Baker. This will be done working cooperatively with other agencies to seek regional solutions to transportation challenges in the areas surrounding Fort Baker, to engage in studies to reduce or eliminate uncontrolled automobile traffic within Fort Baker, and to further reduce parking at Fort Baker. The NPS is specifically committed to working with the City of Sausalito, Marin County Congestion Management Agency, the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

AMENDMENTS/CORRECTIONS TO THE FINAL EIS

The following is a list of minor corrections or other revisions to the Final EIS, including several changes that were made in response to public comment. None of these revisions would affect the outcome of the environmental analysis provided in the EIS or materially change the selected alternative. Upon approval of this Record of Decision, these changes are incorporated by reference into the Final EIS.

VOLUME I:

Section 2.6.1 (Grading, Infrastructure Facilities and Building Foundations, page 2-24)

The mitigation measure related to code requirements for upgrading substandard buildings did not account for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Structures. The text is amended by approval of the ROD, as follows: "All substandard buildings would be upgraded over time, and new construction would meet applicable seismic codes, laws and NPS policies. These include the 1997 Uniform Building Code (or more recent), the 1998 California Building Code (or more recent), the California State Historic Building Code (where application of more stringent code would create an adverse effect under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act), and Seismic Retrofit Laws."

Section 2.6.3 (Water Resources Mitigation, page 2-25)

There was an error in the terminology used in the first mitigation measure in this section. The title of the measure and subsequent use of the following term is revised as shown: "Stormwater

Pollution Prevention Plan” (SWPPP) should be revised to read “Stormwater Management Plan.” As a point of clarification, SWPPPs are already a requirement of the Final EIS as described in Section 2.6.1.

Section 2.6.4 (Biological Resources Mitigation, page 2-29)

Marine Mammals/Seabirds/Waterbirds. This measure is corrected as follows: “The NPS would provide interpretive signage, markers and other materials to inform boaters and other visitors of access restrictions and other appropriate actions to prevent disturbance to marine mammals, wintering waterbirds and nesting seabirds, including waterbirds offshore and nesting seabirds on the Needles near Lime Point. Prior to reopening of the trail to Lime Point, a survey of current bird use of the Needles and Lime Rock would be completed to determine if additional mitigation to avoid disturbance of birds either nesting or resting on the rocks would be necessary. In addition, ongoing monitoring of marine mammal and waterbird activities would continue to document seasonal numbers and distribution of these species, and identify areas where recreational boating restrictions may be implemented. Signage would be provided at the dock and other locations, and maps provided at the marina to clearly identify restricted areas to boaters. Restricted use of identified areas would be enforced by on-site National Park Service law enforcement staff.”

Section 2.6.6 (Traffic and Circulation Mitigation, page 2-32 and 2-34)

Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements. The following sentence will be included as an additional measure at the end of this discussion. “The NPS would provide safety information to bicyclists at Fort Baker and implement bicycle rental restrictions to minimize exposure of bicyclists to existing off-site hazards.”

Transportation Systems Management. The first bullet item shown under “Transportation Systems Management” is revised as shown: “Conzelman Road would be opened to one-way outbound vehicular traffic during peak traffic conditions...”

Chapter 4 – Table 4-1 (Impact Summary Table)

Editorial errors in Table 4-1 indicating that “no new construction” would occur under the Office and Cultural Center Alternative are corrected. As described in Chapter 2 (description of alternatives), new construction would occur under this alternative. This construction would be associated with expansion of the USCG facilities, BADM facilities, and potential removal of Capehart housing units to provide additional parking spaces needed for this alternative. The impact analysis provided in Chapter 4 for this alternative correctly reflects that construction would occur under the Office and Cultural Center Alternative, and the only change needed is to the impact summary table.

Appendix A, Table A-1 (page A-1)

Structure # 415 Mine Wharf (fishing pier) is designated in Table A-1 as “RM” = Remove. This is a typographical error that is corrected by revising the proposed treatment to “RH” = Rehabilitate and Reuse

COMMENTS RECEIVED FOLLOWING RELEASE OF THE FINAL EIS

The Fort Baker Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement was released on October 15, 1999, when more than 200 copies of the document were distributed to other agencies and interested members of the public. Copies were made available in paper and electronic format and the Final EIS was posted on the park's web site. The Environmental Protection Agency published a notice of filing for the Final EIS in the November 5, 1999 *Federal Register*, marking the beginning of the required 30-day no action period. The 30-day no action period closed on December 5, 1999. Oral and written comments on the project and Final EIS were received by the National Park Service during and after the close of the 30-day no action period. The National Park Service considered all comments, and a summary of the issues raised is provided below.

Written Comments

During the 30-day no action period, ten letters and 15 e-mail messages were received. The letters were from 5 individuals and 5 organizations, including National Parks and Conservation Association, National Trust for Historic Preservation, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, City of Sausalito and Sausalito-Marin City Sanitary District. The letters generally focused on opinions regarding the Proposed Action (support or opposition). Seven of the letters were in general support of the public planning process and/or the Proposed Action. The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission submitted a letter acknowledging that the Plan appears consistent with the San Francisco Bay Plan. The City of Sausalito submitted a letter detailing their concerns with potential impacts of the proposed plan and raised questions related to NEPA issues (see discussion below). The local sanitary district letter concurred with the Final EIS analysis and conclusions regarding wastewater capacity but requested that the existing agreement for these services at Fort Baker, and the National Park Service right to use such services, be revisited. The National Park Service has responded to this request and is working with the sanitary district to resolve these issues. The e-mail messages primarily expressed opposition to the retreat and conference center component of the plan, concern related to the size of the retreat and conference center or issues that are not relevant to the National Environmental Policy Act. One message addressed concern related to bicycle safety, which was also addressed in the City of Sausalito letter, and is responded to below. Post cards in support of and in opposition to the Proposed Action were also received during the 30-day no action period.

The primary NEPA issues raised in the City of Sausalito letter relate to the traffic impact methodology and subsequent results of that analysis as presented in the EIS. No new information has been submitted which would change the analysis or conclusions presented in the Final EIS. In response to the City of Sausalito letter, the National Park Service is clarifying the text of a traffic mitigation measure as described above, and has also added an additional measure related to off-site bicycle safety. A comprehensive response to all NEPA-related issues raised in the City of Sausalito letter has been provided in **Appendix B** of this Record of Decision. Consistent with and expanding on the mitigation measures in Appendix A, the NPS is also pursuing further transportation planning, both on its own, and in partnership with the City of Sausalito. The NPS will invite the cooperation of all affected entities in doing so.

Oral Comments

During the November 16, 1999 Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission public meeting, 28 people provided oral comments. Of the total, 20 people spoke in favor of the plan and the public planning process used by the National Park Service to develop the Plan and refine the EIS. Speakers included individuals and representatives of organizations including the

National Parks and Conservation Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Marin Heritage, and the Bay Area Discovery Museum. Six people, including the chair of the Sausalito Citizens' Task Force for Fort Baker, stated their opposition to the retreat and conference center component of the Plan, and expressed concerns related to traffic and the potential effect of the Plan on the character of the site and its resources. One individual questioned the ownership of the land at Fort Baker, and stated that she was unable to find documentation confirming United States Army ownership. One representative of the Tomales Bay Association stated support for the development of a youth hostel (included in the GMP Alternative).

Following the close of the 30-day no action period, the National Park Service received additional postcards and e-mail messages similar to those described above, as well as additional letters. These included letters from Marin Audubon Society, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, Resource Renewal Institute, City of Sausalito, Town of Ross, Town of Tiburon, City of Mill Valley, City of San Rafael, Town of Fairfax, Bay Area Discovery Museum, Marin County Board of Supervisors, Ecumenical Association for Housing, and The Aspen Institute, in addition to letters from individuals. These letters were reviewed and considered by the National Park Service. No new NEPA issues or questions were raised that require response in this Record of Decision or modification to the Final EIS, and these letters did not provide information that would lead to the selection of other alternatives or change the determination that the Proposed Action is the environmentally preferred alternative. The NPS is committed to working with these respondents, as with all interested parties, during implementation of the project, following approval of the Record of Decision.

CONCLUSION

The above factors and consideration warrant adopting the final Fort Baker Plan (identified as the Proposed Action in the Draft and Final EIS) as the General Management Plan Amendment and Implementation Plan for Fort Baker. The Fort Baker Plan will not impair park resources or values, and, in fact, will significantly enhance the site's natural and cultural resources. The 30-day no action period ended on December 5, 1999.

APPROVED:


John J. Reynolds

Regional Director, Pacific West Region

DATE:

6/9/2000

