

Golden Gate National Recreation Area GMP Scoping Summary

August 16, 2006

Background on Scoping Process

The first newsletter issued in March 2006 described the Golden Gate National Recreation Area/Muir Woods National Monument General Management Plan (GMP) process. The newsletter also included a comment form that asked people their opinions on what they value and like most about the park, what they like least, their suggestions for management, their major concerns for the future of the park and any other comments they wanted to provide to the GMP team. Nearly 300 electronic and mailed comments were received in response to this newsletter. Further, five public open houses were held in April 2006 to gather additional input from the public. Focus groups with environmental, historic, and diversity organizations, as well as meetings with Native American representatives, park partners and park founders were also held to gather information about what these groups value about the park, and their concerns and ideas for the general management plan. The results of recent internal scoping meetings with park staff, in addition to meetings held in 2001 and 2003, were also included. The following is a brief summary of the major comments received during the GMP scoping process.

Summary of Scoping Comments

Special Values, What They Like Most

The majority of newsletter respondents and open house attendees were from the San Francisco Bay area. Most people believe the park is special because **they live close to it**; they appreciate the park being close to the city and the relative **ease of access** to enjoy the park resources. Visitors value the undeveloped **open space near a metropolitan setting**, especially since the park makes the area more “livable,” and provides opportunities to “unwind.”

Many also noted how much they value the amazing **natural beauty**, wide open vistas and the variety of scenery in and around the park. They emphasized the **need to protect the park’s natural scenic** character to maintain the natural beauty. **Muir Woods National Monument** was highlighted as a major contributing element to the park’s natural beauty and magnificent views. Many also thought the park was special because it protected the **unique fauna and flora**, providing a lasting legacy of our natural heritage. Respondents also noted how much they value the **cultural and historic resources** in the park and that outstanding cultural resources need to be preserved and interpreted.

Other special values of the park included the opportunities for visitors to enjoy **open space and clean air**, especially in the midst of an urban area. It was noted that the park serves as a “backbone” of open space that connects other public lands. **Quiet** and opportunities for **solitude** were specifically mentioned by many respondents as a special quality of the park. Visitors value being able to “get away” from the noise and intrusions of daily life and enjoy being able to “slow down” and **commune with nature**. The park provides a place of serenity, peace and relaxation.

In answer to the question of what scoping respondents like most about the park, two of the most mentioned topics were the **natural beauty** of the park and associated **scenic views**, along with the opportunity to explore **undeveloped open space**. Further, respondents noted how much they enjoy the **hiking** opportunities in the park as well as the overall **diversity of trail opportunities**. Visitors really enjoy the opportunities for **solitude and quiet**, especially the ability to get away from the noise and

intrusions of daily life. In addition, respondents noted how much they enjoy the natural state of the park – its **diversity of landscapes and processes**. In particular, they noted how much they enjoy **wildlife watching** opportunities and viewing **native plants**. The **educational programs** and associated **information and signage** were also noted as elements of the park that visitors really enjoy.

What They Like Least

The most frequently mentioned topic that people disliked was **transportation**. Parking, traffic, and congestion were often cited as frustrating factors, especially at Muir Woods National Monument. Many people identified the lack of public transportation options and connectivity to park sites as major issues. Residents of adjacent communities dislike the congestion that park visitors bring to area roads, which impedes local traffic.

Crowding and visitor use conflicts were frequently mentioned as problems. Many people felt that the parks were too crowded, especially Muir Woods National Monument, leading to visitor use conflicts. Mountain bikes, dogs, and horses were the most frequently identified items that caused visitor use conflict. **Resource impacts from visitor use**, particularly those recreational activities just mentioned, was another topic that people disliked. Overuse of the park and the balance between visitor access and resource preservation influenced people’s opinion of this issue.

Some people mentioned disliking the level of **maintenance** of visitor amenities, including the grounds, restrooms, trail erosion, and park facilities and structures.

Their Greatest Concerns

The most frequently mentioned concern for the future of the park was **funding**. The lack of funding has caused problems with maintenance and has affected staffing levels, both of which cause grave concern for future park management.

The **level of development and commercialization** of the parks was another major concern. People felt that overdevelopment of the park led to the loss of valuable open space and that eventually the park could be commercialized and then sold off for development.

Resource impacts from visitor use were also frequently mentioned as a concern. Many people felt that the park was being “loved to death” and that this overuse leads to **crowding** and visitor use conflicts.

Restricting public access and reducing recreation opportunities was another concern for many, particularly for mountain bikers, horse riders, and dog owners. Mountain bikers and horse riders were concerned about the availability of trails for their use and dog owners wanted to preserve their ability to let their dogs off-leash.

Deficiencies in park management, including staffing levels and maintenance concerns, were reported by some. A deficiency of park rangers and maintenance personnel were commonly cited as contributing factors. Trails are not designed appropriately for their uses, which leads to maintenance problems.

Things to Consider in the GMP

The most frequently mentioned topic for the NPS to consider in the GMP was **improved alternative transportation** opportunities. Specifically, respondents mentioned the need for easy, convenient and predictable public transportation services that connect primary park entry points and disperse visitors to the wide variety of recreational and educational opportunities throughout the park. A comprehensive

approach to transportation services would increase non-automobile access to the park and help reduce traffic impacts and enhance resource protection.

Further, respondents would like to see the NPS continue to **protect the park's unique natural and cultural resources**. Many specifically mentioned that the diversity of natural landscapes and processes need to be protected with a strategy for prioritizing preservation and restoration activities.

Some people wanted to see **more trail connections** (for all use types) in the park to increase the diversity of recreation and access opportunities. In addition, some asked for new or different opportunities for **mountain biking**, including new routes and opening existing trails to mountain bikes. There were also numerous comments on **improving the design and maintenance of trails**, particularly mountain bike trails – although, the approach on this subject varied amongst respondents (e.g., mountain bikes should only be allowed only on wide/fire road type trails versus narrow, single track trails). **Off-leash dog walking** opportunities was also mentioned as something to consider in the GMP, both in terms of increasing off-leash dog opportunities as well as further restricting existing opportunities. Some people wanted **more signs, maps, and interpretive/education programs** about the park's history, and cultural and natural resources.

Other topics mentioned included the need to **increase NPS funding**, overall **maintenance of facilities and levels of staffing**, especially rangers in the field. There was also mention that the NPS should **not over develop/commercialize the park**, especially as a means to generate revenue.

Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Scoping Code Summaries
August 2006
(organized by code)

Comments related to:

Proximity/Close to Home/Quality of Life (p1)

- Visitors value the closeness of the park and the ease of access; it's "in my backyard"
 - Visitors appreciate the park's proximity to a major city/urban area and value the undeveloped open space that it provides in a metropolitan setting
 - The park makes the area "livable" and provides opportunities to "unwind"
-

Comments related to:

Wildlife (r1)

- The variety and abundance of wildlife (especially birds) in the park makes it special
- Visitors enjoy watching wildlife and desire enhanced interpretation of this resource
- The park contains habitat for a number of threatened and endangered species

Common Concerns:

#1: Habitat fragmentation and loss of wildlife

#2: Impacts from visitor use

Comments related to:

Native Plants (r2)

- Visitors enjoy the variety of native plants, especially trees (redwoods)
 - There is a need for information on how to best restore and manage native plant communities
-

Comments related to:

Preservation (r4)

- Preserving natural resources is very important; it provides a lasting legacy of our natural heritage
- The park plays a vital role in preserving natural systems
- Emphasize and increase resource preservation activities- the preservation focus must come first
- Tension exists between natural and cultural resource preservation and management- need to define areas of emphasis for both

Comments related to:

Nature/Natural Processes (r5)

- Visitors appreciate the natural state of the park- its diversity of natural landscapes and processes
- NPS needs a more comprehensive, integrated approach to natural systems planning and management, with a strategy for prioritizing preservation and restoration activities

Comments related to:

Invasive Plants (r6)

- Visitors are concerned about the effect of invasive, exotic plants on native vegetation communities
- Continue and increase invasive plant control activities

Comments related to:

Resource Impacts from Visitor Use (r7)

- Visitors are concerned about overuse; the parks being “loved to death”
- Visitors are concerned about the balance between access and resource protection
- Visitors are concerned about the damage caused by dogs and horses
- Visitors are concerned about human-caused damage such as littering and vandalism

Common Concerns:

#1: Ability of the parks to handle levels of visitor use (user capacity)

#2: Increasing conflict between public access and resource preservation

Comments related to:

Cultural/Historic (r8)

- Interpret all layers of history; determine the appropriate balance of focus areas (i.e., military vs. Native American vs. prehistoric)
- Preserve/rehabilitate/restore/interpret outstanding historic and cultural resources and cultural heritage
- Need to identify appropriate uses of historic structures and landscapes, including identification of the range of visitor opportunities
- Determine what is practical and feasible regarding building treatments
- Define cultural landscape contributing elements and defining characteristics and determine the limits to change/development
- Need to define areas of natural resource vs. cultural resource emphasis or develop coordinated strategy that prevents impairment (i.e., Marin Headlands/Fort Baker, Alcatraz, Muir Woods)
- Explore cooperative management strategies to increase cultural resource protection on Angel Island, Mt. Tamalpais State Park; preserve and rehabilitate Angel Island Immigration Station

- Explore concept of managing “ruins” – don’t remove all evidence
- Prehistoric resources – interpret those that are accessible, protect against erosion

Common Concerns:

#1: How to preserve/rehabilitate/restore/interpret outstanding cultural resources (buildings, landscapes, etc.) and cultural heritage

#2: Define areas of natural resource vs. cultural resource emphasis and develop coordinated strategy that prevents impairment

Comments related to:

Restoration (r9)

- There is a great need and many opportunities for restoration of natural and cultural resources in the park
- Need to prioritize restoration opportunities and actions

Comments related to:

Geology (r10)

- The geology of the area is special
- There is concern over how to manage the dynamic coastal environment (coastlines)

Comments related to:

Weather (r11)

- The park showcases the area’s great weather
- There is concern about the impacts of climate change- how should the park respond?

Comments related to:

Marine Resources (r13)

- Increase marine resource protection activities

Common Concern:

#1: Threats to marine environment and lack of focus and enforcement

Comments related to:

Collections/Museums (r14)

- Provide for preservation, interpretation, and use of museum collections
- The park needs to determine how to go about addressing its museum preservation problems; possibly explore collaborations with other NPS units or area institutions

- Need to determine plans for Alcatraz collections and Presidio (Crissy/Main Post)

Common Concern:

#1: Preservation, interpretation, and use of museum collections

Comments related to:

Open Space/Clean Air (v1)

- Visitors value the opportunity to enjoy open space and clean/fresh air
- Visitors value open space in the midst of an urban area
- The park preserves a remnant piece of the once-plentiful open spaces and serves as a backbone connecting all public lands
- Protect open space – keep it open

Comments related to:

Beauty/Scenic Views (v2)

- Visitors value the amazing natural beauty, wide open vistas and the variety of scenery
- Visitors value that the natural beauty is within sight of a major city
- Visitors most enjoy the magnificent views and pristine beauty
- Muir Woods is majestic and awesome
- Keep the emphasis on protecting the natural scenic character

Comments related to:

Wildness/Wilderness (v3)

- Preserve the near-urban wilderness, unimproved and maintaining naturalness
- Value the beautiful “wild” scenery and qualities, especially at Muir Woods
- Value the sense of being far-away in a wild area with contemplative recreation opportunities
- Concerned about the loss of wild places to development

Comments related to:

Seeing Wildlife (v4)

- Visitors value wildlife viewing opportunities, especially in close proximity to an urban area

Comments related to:

Solitude/Quiet (v5)

- Visitors value the quiet and opportunities for solitude and being alone in the park
- Visitors value being able to get away from the noise and intrusions of daily life
- Visitors value the peace and tranquility they find in the park, especially Muir Woods

- Need to address overflights and air tours and the effects on the visitor experience and resources

Comments related to:

Renewal/Communion with Nature (v6)

- Visitors value the opportunities to commune with nature and experience renewal
- Visitors value the opportunities to “slow down” and “smell the roses”
- Visitors value the opportunities to get away from the city so close by

Comments related to:

Crowding (v7)

- There are too many people which causes overcrowding
- Overcrowding is occurring at Muir Woods
- Too many people has caused displacement (spatially or temporally)
- The park isn't crowded – need to keep it that way
- Crowds are in good in the sense that people are enjoying the park

Common Concerns:

- #1: Increasing overcrowding, especially at popular places
#2: Too many people has caused displacement

Comments related to:

Crowding Muir Woods (v8)

- There are too many people in Muir Woods
- Need to restrict the number of people to Muir Woods

Comments related to:

Use Conflicts/User Capacity (v9)

- Conflicts with dogs in the park, especially concerns regarding safety, dog waste and resource impacts
- Conflicts with horses, especially concerns regarding safety and horse manure on trails
- Conflicts with bicycling, especially concerns regarding safety and inconsiderate behavior
- Conflicts with different recreation opportunities and wildlife, particularly dog walking
- Conflicts with inconsiderate visitors
- Certain activities (bicycling and equestrian) should be limited/removed
- Need to dedicate trails (spatially or temporally) to specific uses (bicycling and equestrian) to reduce use conflicts
- Conflict with recreational users that may not understand mission for resource protection

Common Concerns:

- #1: Dogs conflicting with other uses of the park
- #2: Conflicts with bicycling, especially conflicts regarding safety and inconsiderate behavior

Comments related to:

Level of Development/Commercialization (v10)

- Concern about too much overdevelopment and commercialism
- Concern that the parks will be given or sold for development purposes
- Concern about existing and/or new concessions in Muir Woods
- Concern about too much development along the park's boundary
- Concern about commercial fishing in park boundaries – over harvesting
- Preserve undeveloped areas, especially beaches
- Visitors value the undeveloped, rural nature of the parks
- Need to determine type of commercial uses the NPS wants to expand or limit and where

Comments related to:

Noise (v11)

- Concern over too much noise from loud people, cell phones on the trail, radios, etc.

Comments related to:

Safety (v12)

- Concern over conflicts with shuttle buses to Muir Woods
- Safety conflicts with multiple users on trails, particularly bicyclists and equestrian
- Need park rangers to assure all visitors are safe
- Disconnects in bike routes, trails and signage lead to safety concerns
- Dog walking improves perception of safety for some visitors

Common Concerns:

- #1: Safety conflicts with multiple users on trails, particularly bicyclists and equestrian

Comments related to:

Health Benefits (v13)

- The opportunity to exercise in the park is highly valued
- Dog walking is a good form of exercise in the park
- Bicycling is a good form of exercise in the park

Comments related to:

Diversity of Recreation Opportunities (ro1)

- Easy access to a variety of natural, cultural and historical resources, especially like the variety of trail opportunities
- Visitors value the many opportunities for recreation including passive and active, and access for diverse audiences
- GGNRA should not forget that the park purpose includes “preserving recreation values”
- Concerned about the potential loss of recreation opportunities, particularly mountain biking, horseback riding and off leash dog walking

Comments related to:

Hiking (ro2)

- Visitors highly value the hiking/walking opportunities in the park, especially the diversity of trail opportunities
- Concerned about needing more hiking trail connections between areas, multiple use on hiking trails that sometimes leads to user conflicts, and trail maintenance

Comments related to:

Mountain Biking (ro3)

- The park has a mountain bike friendly atmosphere
- Concerned about lack of access and the limited amount of trails available to mountain bikes
- Need to establish more trails and open to mountain bikes
- Need to allow mountain biking on the Coastal Trail
- Need to reevaluate trail design and maintenance standards – current practices are out of date – fire roads are not desirable mountain biking trails and lead to higher speeds – narrow trails are safer (see letter on trail building policy) – consider alternate days for different uses
- Need to limit/restrict the amount of mountain biking in the park, including enforcing illegal mountain bike use on trails.
- Need to restrict mountain biking to wider trails/fire roads or mountain bike only trails

Common Concerns:

- #1: Need to open more trails to mountain bike use and design/maintain appropriately
#2: Use conflicts with bicyclists

Comments related to:

Equestrian (ro4)

- Visitors value the horseback riding opportunities, especially in such close proximity to an urban area – the park is one of the last remaining places to ride
- The park needs to be equestrian friendly – don’t lose opportunities for horseback riding
- Concerns about the damage of horses to the park

Comments related to:

Dog Walking (ro5)

- Visitors value the opportunities to recreate with their dogs
 - Concern about restriction of dog walking opportunities
 - Concern about too many dogs, especially related to safety conflicts and resource impacts
-

Comments related to:

Dogs off-leash (ro6)

- Visitors value the opportunities to recreate with their dogs off-leash
 - Concern about restriction of off-leash dog walking opportunities – going to change what has existed for years and city dwellers should have the freedom to walk their dog off-leash
 - Concern about off-leash dogs, especially related to safety conflicts and resource impacts – the dogs are not under control and impact resources (especially wildlife) and other visitors' experiences
-

Comments related to:

Picnicking/Day-Use (ro7)

- Need additional picnicking facilities, including benches at scenic parking areas
-

Comments related to:

Beach Fires (ro8)

- Need to continue beach fire opportunities at Ocean Beach
 - Concerned about smoldering beach fires
-

Comments related to:

Reduction in Recreation Opportunities (ro9)

- Concern about the limited amount of trails available to mountain bikes
 - Concern about restriction of off-leash dog walking opportunities – going to change what has existed for years and city dwellers should have the freedom to walk their dog off-leash
 - Concern about the potential loss of equestrian opportunities
 - Concern about areas being restricted to public access or recreation opportunities being reduced – this is a recreation area, not a wildlife preserve or Yosemite, or Yellowstone
-

Comments related to:

ADA (ro10)

- Need to consider mobility challenges and provide opportunities, especially in Marin Headlands and Alcatraz

Comments related to:

Camping/Overnight Accommodations (ro12)

- Need to consider new camping opportunities – walk-ins, group camping, horse camps
- Concern about illegal camping activities and related impacts
- Keep Hillwood Camp as an NPS asset

Comments related to:

Exercising (ro14)

- Visitors value the use of the trails for running, exercise

Comments related to:

Socialization (ro15)

- Visitors value the opportunities to recreate with family and friends
- Visitors value the opportunities to meet new people in the park

Comments related to:

General Comment on Public Access (a1)

- Visitors appreciate their ease of access to the park
- Maintain existing access and recreation opportunities
- There is an interest in expanding access, especially for mountain bikes
- Need an appropriate balance between access and resource preservation
- Concern about introducing fees that would prohibit equal access for all

Common Concerns:

#1: Limiting or reducing access and recreation opportunities

#2: Inadequate access and riding opportunities for mountain bikes

Comments related to:

Education Programs and Facilities/Interpretation/Park Ranger Programs (e1)

- Use diverse interpretation and educational opportunities to provide visitors with a national park experience and to build an informed constituency; many of the park's resources are hidden or not appreciated because the park has minimal interpretive signing and programs
- The GMP should address tension between preservation of park resources while providing for educational opportunities
- The park's museum collection should be brought out of hiding and incorporated into various park programs and interpretive efforts

- Diverse interpretive programming should include consideration of all NPS audiences including locals and national visitors, internet and national outreach, and to diverse cultural groups
- Suggested facilities include more on-site interpretive signs and programs, a visitor center in San Mateo region and one in Marin

Comments related to:

Signage (e2)

- Signage pollution is caused by signs being thoughtlessly and haphazardly placed within the viewshed of major cultural and natural features; need a comprehensive signing program
- Trail signing should include description of user opportunities, trail characteristics and conditions, and the appropriate use and constraints (e.g. dogs); signs along trails help protect sensitive habitats and visitor safety
- Interpretive signing throughout the park is needed to guide visitors' appreciation and exploration of park resources that are currently hidden for lack of interpretation
- Signs that highlight visitor services such as food, restrooms, etc. are appreciated

Comments related to:

NPS Identification (e4)

- Golden Gate National Recreation Area does not have an identity and its name is a challenge for park visitors to understand
- The visual symbols of the National Park Service (uniform ranger and arrowhead) are often not apparent to visitors at GGNRA or Fort Point National Historic Site
- Bring the National Park Service system to the people
- Visitors are often unable to distinguish when they are within a unit of the National Park Service at GGNRA
- There should be higher standards of preservation and interpretation in a unit of the National Park Service than in local, regional, and state parks
- Bringing a national park experience to people requires visitors to have an understanding of the values associated with the National Park
- GGNRA is a national park not something less
- How does a visitor know when they are in a unit of the national park system
- Muir Woods is branded; visitors know what it means and the expectations for behavior and opportunities; much of what the GGNRA does is not branded
- People do not view the park spaces as special places
- Shrinking National Park Service presence as demonstrated by:
 - security – not as safe with less patrol and backcountry rangers
 - maintenance – less visitor facilities, more occupied by park partners
 - interpretation – less programming, less stewardship, less recognized park staff
- Individual park sites have their own identity but not for the GGNRA as a whole
- Identity of a national park includes:
 - resources and values that are of a national park quality
 - an identity builds public pride in the preservation of the park
 - has national resources, values and a sense of public ownership

- interpretation and educational opportunities leads to understanding and thereby influences behavior
- NPS signs and manages the park's resources to a high level of preservation and interpretation

Comments related to:

Maintenance – General (m1)

- Many visitors were concerned about the cleanliness of parks (debris and trash removal), especially restrooms and beaches
- Concerned about the ability to maintain and upgrade what we currently have (deferred maintenance), in addition to the stresses that new acquisitions will place on the park

Common Concern:

#1: Budget for park maintenance- inadequate resources (staff, funding)

Comments related to:

Maintenance – Trails (m2)

- Many trails need to be maintained due to erosion
- Need more trail connections and linkages
- Current approach to trail planning and construction is not sustainable- need to improve guidelines
- Concern about funding needed for maintenance work

Common Concern:

#1: Budget for trail maintenance- inadequate resources (staff, funding)

Comments related to:

Maintenance – Facilities (m3)

- Concerned about maintenance of roads, restrooms, and military facilities/structures

Common Concern:

#1: Budget for facility maintenance- inadequate resources (staff, funding)

Comments related to:

Foodservice (o1)

- Need to determine the appropriate scale of concessions in the park
- Visitors expressed an interest in foodservice at Muir Woods and Alcatraz.

Comments related to:

User Fees (o2)

- Visitors like that the parks are free of charge
- Some support instituting fees and/or increasing fees

Common Concern:

#1: That free or affordable access for all will be eliminated; prohibiting low income participation

Comments related to:

Funding (o3)

- The park is under funded and can't accomplish its goals or meet citizen demands
- Lack of funding causes shortages in staffing and maintenance
- There is a need for increased funding
- Non-traditional/non-government sources of funding should be explored and pursued

Common Concern:

#1: That the park will continue to be under funded, leading to disrepair and the eventual "sell off" of the park

Comments related to:

Consistency of Rules/Regulations Among Different Public Lands (o4)

- Visitors feel that there are too many rules and restrictions in the park
- There is a need for consistency between the rules/regs of adjacent lands
- Consider the integration of policies where lands connect and/or make sure visitors are aware of variances

Comments related to:

Boundary (o5)

- The park needs to be expanded to save imperiled species and preserve necessary open space
- Because of the park's suburban setting, there are many boundary management issues (encroachment, compatibility)
- The boundary between different public land areas is confusing
- The San Mateo lands present both boundary opportunities (acquiring new lands, seamless recreation area) and challenges (confusing property lines, more neighbors, impacts of adjacent lands, etc.)
- Need to explore opportunities and constraints with respect to the management of Angel Island

Comments related to:

Partnerships (o6)

- Visitors are excited about the diversity of partnerships at work in the park
 - Housing/office space is an important consideration for staff, businesses, and park partners
 - Need to evaluate the appropriateness of partnerships and make sure they are aligned with park goals and objectives; define the primary role of park partners
-

Comments related to:

Enforcement of Rules/Regs/Laws (o7)

- More enforcement is needed, especially for dogs off-leash and illegal mountain bike use and trail construction
 - Need more patrols using both rangers and volunteers
-

Comments related to:

Volunteers/Stewardship (o8)

- Increase use of volunteers for trail patrols and maintenance
 - Tap into expertise of mountain biking community
 - Engage more volunteers in land stewardship
 - Need to define a structure and funding source to ensure the long-term success of volunteerism in the park
-

Comments related to:

Staffing (o9)

- Current staffing does not allow the parks to be properly patrolled and maintained
- Need more rangers

Common Concern:

#1: Current staffing is inadequate to meet citizen demands and effectively protect resources

Comments related to:

Marketing (o11)

- Need to market and communicate visitor opportunities, especially for San Mateo lands
-

Comments related to:

Communication Capabilities- Technology (o12)

- Need to stay abreast of changing technology and embrace it to advance park objectives
-

Comments related to:

Administration/Management (o13)

- There is a lack of resources to do the job right
- Need to better coordinate park actions against external threats
- Need to set priorities, which are grounded in fiscal reality
- The use of volunteers in the park needs to be more programmatically developed
- Need to better coordinate with adjacent public land managers (PORE, MUWO, SF Watershed, State Parks)
- Explore cooperative management arrangements with State Parks (Angel Island, Mt. Tamalpais)

Comments related to:

Fire Management (o14)

- Work with communities to minimize fire risk

Comments related to:

Research (o15)

- The park contains many resources and information that are worthy of research
- The scale of research activities in the park needs to be defined/refined

Comments related to:

Transportation (t1, t2, t3, t4, t5, t6)

- Allow for local residential traffic to be unimpeded by park visitors in communities adjacent to and within the park
- There needs to be easy, convenient and predictable public transportation services that connect to the primary park entry points and then within the park to disperse and provide visitor use to the wide variety of recreational and educational opportunities and to reduce traffic impacts and to enhance resource protection; a comprehensive approach needs to ensure visitor access everyday and not just during peak periods
- Park transportation system should provide for visitor access in addition to services of local residents in park dependent communities and our park partners
- Provide greater opportunities for non-automobile access to and within the park that includes early morning and late evening schedules in order for visitors to experience the park during those hours
- The park needs to provide for public access throughout the park that is not dependent on personal cars.
- ADA access must be considered for any solution in providing visitor access
- A comprehensive transportation strategy should include removing parking, roads and related facilities that substantially impact park resources and values
- Don't pollute the park experience with Charter Bus services
- Visitor experience includes multiple demands for trails that support opportunities for mountain biking, horse riding, and hiking, each of which often can impacts the other

Comments related to:

Public Input (pl1)

- The public appreciates the chance to be involved and provide comments
- Community involvement is critical to the success of the planning effort and the subsequent implementation of the GMP

Comments related to:

Collaborate with Partners (pl2)

- Collaborate on regional trail projects and trail connections for local municipalities
- Need to collaborate with other land managers (local, state, and federal) to produce a seamless network of public lands
- Improve interagency cooperation on habitat improvement and restoration
- Further define the relationship between park partners and volunteers and GGNRA

Comments related to:

Visitor Use Projections (pl3)

- Need to understand the ramifications of a growing population, changing demographics, and future values and uses

Comments related to:

New Facilities (f1)

- Visitors expressed the most interest in additional trail opportunities and trail connections (north-south connections to state parks and all GGNRA areas; east-west connections between city and ocean; locales including Coastal Trail, Tennessee Valley, Sweeney Ridge, Phleger Estate, SF Watershed, Montana Mountain, Bolinas, and Diaz Ridge Trail)
- Ideas for desirable new facilities include restrooms, benches, trash cans, signs, water fountains, and visitor centers

Comments related to:

Sustainability (s1)

- The park should do more to promote and implement sustainability: develop “green policies”, explore opportunities for sustainable water and utility systems, and use green principles in all facility upgrades

Comments related to:

Miscellaneous (mi1)

- Many visitors think that GGNRA is doing a great job
- Some are concerned about the never ending cycle of planning at GGNRA and that GMP planning takes too long
- There is a mistrust of government, and in particular the leadership of the Bush administration with respect to their dedication to “parks in perpetuity”

Common Concern:

#1: That the park will be developed or sold off