

# **Summary of Scoping Comments Giacomini Wetlands Restoration Project**

## **National Park Service Point Reyes National Seashore**

### **Introduction**

The National Park Service (NPS) purchased the approximately 563-acre Waldo Giacomini Ranch in 2000 for the purposes of wetland restoration. Funding for this purpose came from Congressional appropriations and monies from the California Department of Transportation in exchange for the NPS assuming certain mitigation obligations. The NPS, in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), is preparing a combined Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in fall 2002 to assess alternative strategies for restoration of the Ranch. In the fall of 2002, the NPS conducted initial public scoping for the Giacomini Wetlands Restoration Project EIS/EIR. Following scoping, the NPS began working on developing preliminary restoration concepts. In spring/summer 2004, the NPS held a series of workshops to gather public input on these preliminary restoration and public access concepts. A summary of comments received from the public and NPS, regulatory, local, and state agency staff during the workshops and in the scoping period that ended July 23, 2004, is presented in this report.

### **Public Scoping Process**

Public scoping is held early in the NEPA process in order to elicit public input on the range of concerns, issues, and potential alternatives that should be addressed within the EIS/EIR. The NPS issued a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental document in the Federal Register in September 2002, which included information on the public scoping process. Public scoping was conducted during the fall/winter of 2002. The NPS introduced the project's purpose and need at a public meeting held at the Dance Palace on October 19, 2002, and comments were solicited on potential impacts and/or concerns. During scoping, the NPS identified the State Lands Commission, which owns the central portion of Lagunitas Creek, as the lead agency for the concurrent state regulatory process under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The NPS will act as the project manager and lead agency for the federal planning process under NEPA. The Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary, whose jurisdiction extends into Tomales Bay, is also actively participating in the planning process.

After scoping closed in the winter of 2003, a staff report was prepared summarizing comments received during initial scoping. Issues raised during the initial months of scoping include potential project effects on:

- flooding of private residences and county roads near the Project Area,
- increasing saltwater intrusion into local groundwater wells,
- local community and agriculture,
- water quality of Tomales Bay,

- special status species and habitat within the Project Area.
- expansion of the restoration project to include Olema Marsh; and
- the potential to improve the safety of public access for pedestrians and bicyclists between the western and eastern sides of southern Tomales Bay.

Following scoping, the NPS held a series of internal workshops designed to prioritize restoration objectives based on a number of factors, including mitigation requirements, project Purpose, project Goals, and concerns raised by the public and agencies during scoping. The NPS project staff began working with its hydrologic consultants, Kamman Hydrology & Engineering (KHE), to develop preliminary restoration concepts. After a series of internal meetings, the NPS met with regulatory and local and state agencies on February 26, 2004, to present these preliminary concepts.

The NPS also felt that it was very important to meet with landowners adjacent to the Project Area early in the restoration development process, particularly with regards to flooding concerns. The NPS contacted landowners along Levee Road and the east side of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in Inverness Park, which are areas that historically have had the most flooding concerns. Approximately 21 landowners and agency staff attended the workshop on March 30, 2004. Following these meetings, the NPS project staff also met with representatives of stakeholder groups from Marin County and interested agencies, including the Marin County Bicycle Coalition, Sierra Club – Marin chapter, Marin Conservation League, Sacramento office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered Species section, North Marin Water District, and local technical experts in the field of wetland restoration.

The culmination of these meetings and consultations was a public workshop held on June 22, 2004, at the Point Reyes National Seashore (Seashore) Red Barn at 6:00 p.m. The NPS mailed 263 notices announcing the public workshop for the Giacomini Wetlands Restoration Project on May 12, 2004. The letter noted that the Seashore was holding a workshop to discuss and gather input on preliminary restoration and public access concepts that had been developed for the Giacomini Wetlands Restoration Project. On June 7, 2004, a press release announcing the public workshop was distributed to the *Point Reyes Light*, *Marin Independent Journal*, and *Press Democrat*, as well as 28 other media outlets, including newspapers, radio stations, and television stations. Meeting information was also posted on the Seashore's website. The local radio station, KWMR, broadcast information about the meeting during a noontime Park Wavelengths show on June 14, 2004. A notice of the workshop was printed in the *Point Reyes Light* newspaper on June 10, 2004. The meeting was well attended with 114 people present. The *Point Reyes Light* published an account of the meeting on June 24, 2004.

At the workshop, NPS project staff and consultants presented the Project background, outlined the planning process to date, summarized initial scoping issues, and explained the preliminary restoration concepts. Information was also provided on habitats that might develop within the Project Area as a result of Project implementation. These future restoration scenarios were based on the hydrodynamic modeling and analysis performed by KHE. After the presentation, the superintendent of the Seashore, Don Neubacher, answered questions from the audience. The attendees, then, separated into four (4) breakout groups for more detailed discussion of the

restoration concepts. Group notes were taken by designated note-takers. At the end of the meeting, all the groups convened for a few brief concluding remarks by Mr. Neubacher.

Following the meeting, the public had a 30-day period ending July 23, 2004, in which to submit comments to the NPS on the restoration concepts and scope of the proposed EIS/EIR. During this period, the NPS received more than 100 letters or petitions, phone calls, and requests for meetings. The NPS met with three groups of West Marin residents that were interested specifically in effects of the Project on land use, development, and character of the community or the potential for using the historic railroad grade for public access.

This document summarizes the full range of comments received by the NPS during the scoping period in meetings with the public, adjacent landowners, regulatory and local and state agencies and organizations in writing or email to the park. The NPS has also met with technical experts in the field of wetland restoration during this period to get feedback on the technical appropriateness of the restoration concepts proposed. Their comments also incorporated into this summary of scoping.

### **Review of Scoping Letters**

To ensure that all comments and/or issues raised in letters or oral comments received during the scoping period were noted and summarized accurately, all of the letters received from both individuals, organizations, and agencies were reviewed by Lorraine Parsons, Wetlands Ecologist and Project Manager, and Amy Langston, Biological Technician. The scoping packet was then reviewed by members of the Project's Interdisciplinary Planning Team in verify that all the comments within letters and notes of the meeting had been recorded and that the content of each comment was represented in the summary.

Comments and/or issues that shared a common theme were consolidated to the extent possible, and then a table was prepared that listed all of the issues and/or concerns under major issue headings (Appendix A).

### **Public Response to Scoping**

Approximately 58 individuals and 14 private organizations or agencies mailed, faxed, or emailed comments regarding the Giacomini Project by the July 23, 2004 close of the scoping period. Commenting organizations include the Rails to Trails Committee, Environmental Action Committee of West Marin, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, Audubon Canyon Ranch, Sierra Club, Audubon Society, Marin Conservation League, Tomales Bay Association, Inverness Yacht Club, Point Reyes Village Association, and County of Marin Public Works. The NPS also received two petitions with a total of approximately 450 signatures.

This staff report consolidates the scoping comments under five (5) major issue headings – Purpose and Objectives, Planning, Restoration Design and Concerns, Public Access, and Miscellaneous (Appendix A). More than 80 percent of the comments received during the public workshop and the subsequent scoping period concerned public access, ranging from letters and petitions advocating no public access at all to letters and petitions urging that the NPS strongly

consider a path along the historic railroad grade near the Point Reyes Mesa, in addition to a path between Point Reyes Station and Inverness Park.

Written comments received by the NPS are available for review at the Seashore Administration Building, 1 Bear Valley Road, Point Reyes Station, CA. This summary report will be available on the Seashore's web site under the Giacomini Project section of Management Documents.

### **Next Steps in Planning Process**

During the coming months, the NPS project team will hold internal meetings with NPS staff and agency and organization partners to review and discuss your comments and consider reformulating or refining the alternatives analyzed in the EIS/EIR. The NPS will begin preparing the environmental document this year. A draft EIS/EIR is expected to be available for public review in 2005. If a restoration project is approved, the NPS expects that construction could begin as early as 2006.

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

<b>General Topic</b>	<b>Specific Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Planning: Project Purpose and Objectives</b>	<b>No Public Access; Restoration Only</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We encourage the Park Service to perform restoration without compromise for human interests and access. Propose returning it to the wild, leaving it as a place that the public does not enter.</li> <li>• Can't think of anything worse and less in keeping with the stated mission of the Restoration than to have dog-walkers, hikers, bikers, and horseback riders filing back and forth along a creek and wetland that is trying to become the home of shorebirds, turtles, reptiles, insects, and fish.</li> <li>• Concern that the need for the bay to function healthily should be the priority and should override smaller human needs.</li> <li>• Isn't the project acreage too small, overall, to share with human recreation?</li> <li>• A wetlands should be for wildlife and not for humans. Even paths are a threat to wildlife. No trails through the restored marsh or even on the margins of the marsh or a bridge across Lagunitas Creek.</li> <li>• Paths, dogs, horses, going through the wetlands would impinge on the functioning of the wetlands. I am against these.</li> <li>• To compromise the Giacomini wetlands with public access trails seems to be a misallocation of precious coastal wetland habitat.</li> <li>• Since funds are limited and money spent on a trail could be used on marsh restoration, then trail construction would actually conflict with marsh restoration, in which case it would be at odds with the goals of the project.</li> <li>• Don't want monies for public access to distract from achieving restoration goals.</li> </ul>
	<b>Restoration Should Take Priority Over Public Access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our clear preference is for the most complete restoration possible over human access. We do not lack for places to hike, ride horses or bicycle, or walk our dogs. We do lack fully restored and functioning wetlands...</li> <li>• Support public access as long as it does not compromise wetland restoration goals.</li> <li>• Other considerations (public access, etc.) should be secondary to the primary goal of restoration and should be incorporated into the design only if they do not compromise wetland restoration goals or impose disturbance on wildlife.</li> <li>• Access to the restoration site is important for an understanding of the restoration, provided that access does not compromise the restoration itself.</li> <li>• The Park Service has a basic responsibility to return properties like this to their natural state and conserve them for the future. Recreation is also a priority for the NPS, but must take second priority to conservation if it comes down to such.</li> <li>• In favor of maximum restoration and feels that is a priority over multi-trail use. This is a remarkable opportunity to recreate what originally existed. Realizes it is difficult to get to Inverness from Point Reyes, however, strongly feels restoration is most important.</li> </ul>
	<b>Restoration and Public Access/Safety Both Important</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviving as much of the tidelands as possible is important. Equally important would be an all-weather, crushed granite path that runs from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street to Inverness Park with a bridge crossing the creek at the old dirt-dam site.</li> <li>• We should sensitively incorporate the movement of pedestrians into the periphery given that humans are a part of the environment and that Park and small surrounding communities are inextricably intermeshed.</li> <li>• Believe that public appreciation of the new wetlands will be enhanced with local access on the edges.</li> <li>• Public safety should be paramount, it should not compete with habitat restoration.</li> <li>• There should be a balance between safety and natural resource protection.</li> <li>• We are for marshes, but also for bike and pedestrian traffic.</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

General Topic	Specific Topic	Comments
<i>Planning: Project Purpose and Objectives (Cont.)</i>	<b>Balancing Community/ Restoration Needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is good for the community should be good for the Park and vice versa. -should be more communication between the two.</li> <li>• Feels the Park is stuck between a rock and a hard place, because people are in favor of full restoration, however, they are also in favor of multi-use trails.</li> <li>• The National Park Service has the management goals of pursuing resource protection and visitor use. Often, these two goals come into conflict. If a pathway is built into a marsh, it will undoubtedly increase public enjoyment and use of that marsh, but at the same time the actual construction of the path and cumulative use will have at least some negative impacts on the plant and animal life. The NPS must carefully balance these conflicting goals.</li> <li>• Respect the attempt to keep intact the environmental integrity of this extension to PRNS. "Given that those of us who live in the towns surrounding Tomales Bay also play host to the many visitors to the Seashore, some compromise has to be reached for local walkers' safe pedestrian use of a small portion of the land next to a main highway running alongside Park territory."</li> </ul>
<i>Planning: Process</i>	<b>Acceptability of Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public access issue was not adequately considered before April 2004.</li> <li>• The costly Philip Williams &amp; Associates report 1993 study contains no analysis on how the public access on the property can possibly coexist with restoring the property's riparian habitat. Access was well known issue, so this suggests that it was intentionally withheld.</li> <li>• Web site does not show location of historic railroad grade. Withholding this information harms the public comment process and thusly makes it invalid.</li> <li>• No information has been made public that discloses the cost to reopen the historic railroad grade. Only when the NPS conducts a cost-benefit analysis that places high monetary value on public safety, and considers how other similar park properties have successfully accommodated public access along side riparian habitats – can the NPS say it meets the standards of the federal government's full disclosure requirements.</li> </ul>
<i>Planning: Alternatives</i>	<b>Acceptability of Alternatives</b>	<p><b>No Action:</b> CalTrans mitigation requirements are not satisfied by the 3.6 acres proposed under the Giacomini Marsh "No Action" Alternative, because it was always understood that significant additional wetland acres should be restored by CalTrans.</p> <p><b>Alternatives A and B:</b> Neither fulfills the "full restoration" representations made to the TAC and to the public.</p>
	<b>Preference for Alternatives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Action or Alternative A</li> <li>• Alternative C</li> <li>• Alternative C with modification</li> <li>• Alternative C or D</li> <li>• Alternative D</li> <li>• Alternative D with modification</li> </ul>
	<b>Comments, Proposed Modifications of Alternatives</b>	<p><b>Alternative C:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favor immediate removal of the Tomasini Creek tidegate. Most obtrusive structure on the property. The goby is adaptable.</li> <li>• The inclusion of a multi-use trail from Point Reyes Station to Inverness Park should only be included if it does not interfere with the restoration process.</li> <li>• Increase the span of the causeway under Levee Road as much as possible from the proposed 25 feet. Would substantially improve natural processes.</li> <li>• Consider possibility of including additional excavation at forked tributaries in northern portion of Olema Marsh that were historically present.</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

General Topic	Specific Topic	Comments
<p><b>Planning: Alternatives (Cont.)</b></p>	<p><b>Comments, Proposed Modifications of Alternatives (Continued)</b></p>	<p><b>Alternative C (Continued):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open grassy areas (such as proposed in East Pasture) often become overrun by social trails and will instead become a de-facto summer recreational area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative D:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative D does not have a bridge: can alternatives be mixed and matched?</li> <li>• Alternative D should incorporate a bridge and trail.</li> <li>• Exclude access until natural “systems” of the wetlands restoration area have a chance to establish themselves. Then, consider incorporating public access.</li> <li>• Concerned that Alternative D does not provide a sufficient buffer zone around the periphery to sustain some critical listed species that occur on the site....” NPS encouraged to develop the maximum buffer width possible.</li> <li>• Tidegate on Tomasini Creek should be removed as soon as possible if the protection of the tidewater goby and other special status species can be assured.</li> <li>• Include riparian revegetation in realigned portion of Tomasini Creek in Tomasini Triangle.</li> <li>• Leave fill in southeast corner of East Pasture in place and allow willows to spread into this area instead of excavating it.</li> <li>• Incorporate some grassland buffer.</li> <li>• Encourage a continuum of unbroken and uninterrupted habitat from Tomasini Creek to top of the Point Reyes Mesa bluff.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatives C and D</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restore historic path of Tomasini Creek sooner rather than later.</li> <li>• Include features in Olema Marsh component that would maintain circulation throughout the marsh.</li> <li>• Creation of a new channel in Olema Marsh will enhance the flow of Bear Valley Creek and reduce flooding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatives A-D</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace all the proposed trail alignments in Alternatives A-C with one that routes along the Green Bridge and Levee Road to the White House Pool County Park and then runs along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard.</li> <li>• Have you thought about having the No Action component in the West Pasture for all of the alternatives?</li> <li>• Was the possibility of an alternative in which both the East and West Pasture levees were allowed to naturally decay ever considered?</li> <li>• What about having an alternative in which the levees and tidegates are removed, but nothing else is done?</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Alternatives - Miscellaneous</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the costs of Alternative D?</li> <li>• Alternative D looks the most expensive. If cost deciding factor, it could be accomplished in phases.</li> <li>• Monitor impacts of Alternative C, then decide whether or not to pursue additional procedures in Alternative D.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Restoration Design and Concerns</b></p>	<p><b>Soil Excavation</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you looking at the effects of mitigation, which can cause adverse effects (i.e. relocating soil to sensitive habitats creating corridors for invasion of non-native plant and animal species)?</li> <li>• What would happen with excavated soils?</li> <li>• Large concern about the amount of material to be removed. It has the highest risk of “unintended consequences” of any of the actions.</li> <li>• While there may be increased environmental values from excavation, amount of excavation may be so costly as to endanger the Park’s ability to complete restoration.</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

<b>General Topic</b>	<b>Specific Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Restoration Design and Concerns (Cont.)</b>	<b>Sedimentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the potential for increased sedimentation of Tomales Bay and about sediment dumping in Olema and Lagunitas creeks, thereby raising the streambed.</li> <li>• Has the Park modeled the sedimentation of the creeks and Bay?</li> <li>• What does the Park want to do about sedimentation (dredging, etc)</li> <li>• In Alternative D, when everything is open, how will that affect outflow into Tomales Bay? The outlet will be smaller, and will there be a sediment build-up?</li> <li>• Will deconstructing the levees accelerate soil deposition?</li> <li>• Is there a sediment budget?</li> <li>• What will happen to the pasture once the levee along Lagunitas Creek is removed, especially with soil deposition?</li> <li>• Will the area that is excavated in Alternative D just fill in? Discussion as to whether that is necessarily a negative if it prevents sediment from going to Tomales Bay.</li> <li>• If the levees are removed, will soil deposition in Tomales Bay slow down?</li> <li>• Would the Park Service continue to remove sediment from the 1906 drainage? The freshwater marsh creation area would need to leave room for an access road.</li> <li>• There were observations that Lagunitas Creek had aggraded considerably over the last few decades and that this might be increasing flooding of homes on Levee Road.</li> </ul>
	<b>Soil Excavation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you looking at the result of mitigation? Many projects cause adverse effects caused by mitigation (i.e. relocating soil to sensitive habitats creating corridors for non-native species).</li> <li>• What would happen with excavated soils?</li> <li>• Large concern about the amount of material to be removed. It has the highest risk of “unintended consequences” of any of the actions.</li> <li>• It is possible that there are increased environmental values to be gained from Alternative D, but it seems that the amount of excavation may be so costly as to endanger the Park’s ability to complete the restoration.</li> </ul>
	<b>Seismic Activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the effect of seismic activity</li> </ul>
	<b>Flooding/ Hydrology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What will happen when there is significant flood flow? Where will the water go?</li> <li>• Was the original channel of Lagunitas on the west side?</li> <li>• What about sea level rise- factored into hydrologic and geomorphology modeling?</li> <li>• Any word from the county concerning flood management along Levee Road?</li> <li>• Why are we retaining the flashboard dam/tidegate on Tomasini Creek?</li> <li>• Will the Project reduce tidal exchange north of the Project Area?</li> <li>• Will the Project increase flooding in Fish Hatchery Creek north of the Project Area near Inverness?</li> <li>• Strongly support removal of West Pasture levees.</li> <li>• Might Project cause Lagunitas Creek to meander or avulse, jumping away from its current course.</li> <li>• Concern about the potential for increased saltwater intrusion into groundwater from implementation of project.</li> <li>• How will the tides affect flooding of homes and Levee Road if restoration project is implemented?</li> <li>• How would the restoration project affect salinity of the groundwater underneath the Giacomini Ranch?</li> </ul>
<b>Nitrogen/Fecal Pollution</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will opening levees to tidal flushing cause the Bay to be exposed to more nitrogen load/pollution from manure in pastures?</li> </ul>	



**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

General Topic	Specific Topic	Comments
<b>Restoration Design and Concerns (Cont.)</b>	<b>Biodiversity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How would the flora and fauna be changed by this Project? Would they increase?</li> <li>• Which alternative is best for wildlife?</li> <li>• Interested in having the alternative that is the most flora/fauna friendly</li> </ul>
	<b>Vegetation and Habitats</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question the designation of the southeast corner of the restoration project as grassland. Should be riparian.</li> <li>• Urge greater respect for edges in restoration design.</li> <li>• Eliminating non-native species should be a goal.</li> <li>• To allow the wetland to approach pristine conditions and achieve full ecological function, weeds must be controlled.</li> </ul>
	<b>Species of Concern - Fish</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will alternatives B, C &amp; D impact the tidewater goby habitat? Whatever the NPS selects as a preferred alternative, the protection of the tidewater goby needs to be considered.</li> <li>• How will routing Tomasini Creek into the East Pasture Old Slough in Alternative C affect the tidewater goby?</li> <li>• Is there any proposal to connect the Inverness Ridge tributaries to the mainstem or central portion of Lagunitas Creek? Is there any potential to increase or improve fish habitat in these tributaries?</li> <li>• What will this project do with the fishway (Denil)? Whatever happens to the Denil will effect the dynamics of the creek.</li> <li>• How do the effects on salmon differ from Alternative C to Alternative D?</li> <li>• How will the restoration project affect migration of salmonids in terms of the amount of ponding upstream of White House Pool and changes in water temperature? Have you incorporated temperature, as well as salinity, in the hydraulic model?</li> </ul>
	<b>Species of Concern – Amphibians and Rails</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which alternatives would be best for frogs?</li> <li>• How would removal of the North Levee and subsequent flooding in the West Pasture affect rails?</li> <li>• Would red-legged frog habitat increase in Olema Marsh in C and D, or if you opened Olema Marsh and Bear Valley Creek culvert, would you extend bull frog habitat?</li> <li>• Need well-developed transition zones for species such as rails. Abrupt transitions create edge effect.</li> </ul>
	<b>Olema Marsh/ Levee Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Against inclusion of Olema Marsh in the project with construction of a large culvert/bridge for Bear Valley Creek underneath Levee Road. It's the larger causeway/bridge that bothers me. It would be just gross having it there.</li> <li>• What about possibly raising Levee Road so the Bay can better clean itself, rather than further developing other existing levees for our own use?</li> <li>• The greater water flow to the Olema Marsh proposed in Alternative D will be of great benefit and should help control the cattail growth.</li> <li>• As long as Levee Road is in place, the idea of returning the entire wetland to a pristine condition from Olema to Tomales Bay is flawed.</li> <li>• Do not support the sluicing out of Bear Valley Creek at this time... proposed channelization of Bear Valley Creek through the Bear Valley marsh has not been well thought out and may have detrimental effects on the marsh. It is also contrary to the Park's policy on lower Olema Creek.</li> <li>• No elimination of existing footbridge over Bear Valley Creek near Levee Road.</li> <li>• Anything that would make the Olema Marsh more integral with the larger wetland would be desirable.</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

<b>General Topic</b>	<b>Specific Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<i>Restoration Design and Concerns</i>	<b>Other</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has anyone looked at Bivalve Railroad levee to consider removal?</li> <li>• The power line across Lagunitas Creek between Inverness Park and White House Pool is a safety hazard, particularly for sailors. Is there any way that power line can be raised several feet or moved?</li> </ul>
<i>Public Access</i>	<b>General Support of Public Access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resident of Inverness Park feels strongly about full restoration. He also feels strongly about multi-use trail that will encourage exercise (foot and bike).</li> <li>• There should be two types of public access, those oriented towards the general public (such as the overlooks) and those oriented towards local access (the trail with bridge)</li> <li>• Need to get people away from road</li> <li>• Automobile use and subsequent road run-off can damage wetland habitats. Encouraging the increased bicycle and pedestrian trips will help the Point Reyes National Seashore improve the environmental quality of the area through alternative modes of transportation and help to educate the public on the benefits of a co-existence with and a respect for the natural environment.</li> <li>• We want a path that will allow people a safe alternative to walking and riding along our narrow roads, yet one that has the least environmental impact possible.</li> <li>• This will be the opportunity of a lifetime for the residents at the head of Tomales Bay to get out of their automobiles and walk, bike, or ride to the main section of the National Seashore or to Inverness Park.</li> <li>• Thanks to the very special area that we live in, the traffic has increased dramatically, to the point where many locals avoid driving to town on weekends. Also, when more housing is built in town, it will be of even greater importance for locals to have a safe way to walk, bike, or horseback ride out of town to enjoy our wonderful Parks.</li> </ul>
	<b>Generally Against Public Access or in Favor of Limited Public Access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support bicycle paths in Marin County, but do not feel that the habitat values of the wetland should be compromised in order to route bicyclists across the restored marsh levees.</li> <li>• What sort of visitor access is compatible with the restoration of the wetland?</li> <li>• Public access should continue to exist only along informal social paths.</li> <li>• Access to this restoration area should be limited and for purposes of education only, not for recreation or for transit.</li> <li>• Exclude access until natural “systems” of the wetlands restoration area have a chance to establish themselves. Then, consider incorporating public access.</li> </ul>
	<b>General Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Find it regrettable that state and county agencies with significant pedestrian and bike transportation responsibilities have attempted to pass the buck on to the NPS marsh restoration for this linking pathway.</li> <li>• Should our set of local wishes (re: public access) weigh more than theirs (tourists and taxpayers who come to see nature), and, if so, why and when?</li> <li>• A study on public access is needed.</li> </ul>
	<b>Public Safety</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trail is not just a matter of public access, but public safety, in terms of providing a connection between Point Reyes Station and Inverness.</li> <li>• This project should develop a path parallel to Sir Francis Drake Boulevard; it is desirable to consider a safe path for children and pedestrians.</li> <li>• Bicycle safety along Sir Francis Drake Blvd (SFDB) should be a component of the project.</li> <li>• Concerned about cyclist safety on existing corridors.</li> <li>• Some compromise has to be reached for local walkers’ safe pedestrian use of a small portion of the land next to a main highway running alongside Park territory.</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

<b>General Topic</b>	<b>Specific Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Public Access (Cont.)</b>	<b>Hydrology and Public Access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design and construction of the bridge should not impede the hydrologic processes of the creek.</li> <li>• When considering trail development, the design should consider impacts to the resource and how the trail will be affected by flooding and hydrology of the marsh.</li> <li>• Study trail design that will compensate for flooding.</li> <li>• Bridge across Lagunitas Creek would be very large and expensive to stand against all floods. Also, a trail would have to be an all-weather trail. Therefore difficult to allow floodwaters to cross the path and enter the pasture to the north.</li> <li>• Flooding could threaten path or require a very expensive, permanent properly engineered bridge.</li> <li>• Federal projects receive only one capital funding allocation with the expectation that the maintenance or repair cost will be nil. Therefore, there will be a tendency to construct facilities which will be very permanent and not get washed away during flooding events.</li> </ul>
	<b>Adjacent Landowners and Effect on Community</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that landowners should be contacted about their thoughts on Public Access proposals during the study for the EIS/EIR.</li> <li>• Concern about increased use leading to noise and trash: Existing situation at North Levee used as example of concern that public access will cause an increase in traffic and parking (at the side of the road).</li> <li>• Speed limit concern on Levee Road.</li> <li>• The Park Service should keep in mind that the Marin Countywide Plan and the updated Pt. Reyes Village Plan contain specific language protecting quiet residential neighborhoods from gross intrusion.</li> </ul>
	<b>Effect of Public Access on Wildlife</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about disturbance to wildlife from large number of cyclists: The noise created by cyclists could scare wildlife.</li> <li>• Viewing of wildlife is not compatible with a bridge and multi-use access.</li> <li>• Impacts to habitat for black rails from inclusion of public access: Has anyone considered the lost opportunities for humans and black rails if they go extinct?</li> <li>• Any through trail would represent huge impacts on endangered marsh creatures.</li> <li>• Trail use has been shown to be compatible with sensitive wetland habitats. Recent BCDC study shows that there is no general relationship between trail use and either bird abundance or overall species diversity in foraging habitat in the San Francisco Bay area.</li> <li>• Does an additional path provide access to new predators?</li> <li>• The elimination of paths or boardwalks through or immediately adjacent to the wetland also limits or reduces predator access to the site.</li> </ul>
<b>Southern Path: Point Reyes Station to Inverness Park</b>		
<b>General Support of Path</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Person is an avid biker and feels creating a bike path along Levee Road would increase physical activity, safety issues, and decrease car traffic.</li> <li>• Multi-use path along the perimeter would enhance the quality of life for residents and visitors alike.</li> <li>• Oppose any plan to locate a pedestrian bridge upstream of White House Pool. Would cause loss of navigable waterway. However, would accept bridge in the current proposed location if some place to tie up boats and climb up the bank were provided downstream of the bridge.</li> <li>• Local horseback rider is very happy with the idea of a bridge connecting to Olema Marsh. It is very dangerous to horseback ride from Levee Road to SFD. This trail would provide safe horseback riding for locals.</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

General Topic	Specific Topic	Comments
<b>Public Access (Cont.).</b>	<b>Southern Path: Point Reyes Station to Inverness Park (Continued)</b>	
	<b>Generally Against Path</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We particularly object to.... alternatives that provide for a pedestrian bridge near the old summer dam allowing people to be adjacent to the marsh.</li> <li>• You must know that many advocates of a trail from Point Reyes Station to Inverness Park are not interested in experiencing the restoration process but simply want safe and pleasant access between the two, an understandable desire but not one that the Park is mandated to fill.</li> <li>• Against popular sentiment for a multi-access public pathway along Lagunitas Creek bridging to White House Pool. Issue blown out of proportion by special interest groups that see this project as a way of solving safety and convenience problems that the community needs to address with the County. “Share the Road” and give the wetland back to nature.</li> <li>• Constructing a six-foot wide path will have significant negative impacts... Those negative impacts must be weighed against community use of this half to one-mile addition to the existing path.</li> </ul>
	<b>Safety</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support efforts to establish a safe route.</li> <li>• Desire more safety than walking on or beside the existing road.</li> </ul>
	<b>Target Users</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpath only, no bikes. Bike path would be disruptive to fauna that resides in the marsh, and it would change the dynamic for us humans who would envision a passive recreational experience in a sensitive environment.</li> <li>• Hiking, biking, and horses.</li> <li>• Multi-use</li> <li>• Bicycles or pedestrian</li> <li>• Pedestrians and some bicyclists; no horses.</li> </ul>
	<b>Origin of Path</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is a path, it should start on C Street near cross street with Sheriff’s substation to discourage negative aspects of trail, i.e., vagrancy, vandalism, etc.</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in Point Reyes Station</li> <li>• No trailhead in downtown Point Reyes Station</li> <li>• Trailhead should not be near residences in Point Reyes Station.</li> <li>• Donovan property near the Green Bridge</li> <li>• Green Bridge</li> </ul>
	<b>Location</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing road right-of-way</li> <li>• Running adjacent to Sir Francis Drake Boulevard</li> <li>• “Off-street path”</li> <li>• Away from the roadway</li> <li>• Off the road’s shoulder</li> <li>• Off-street</li> <li>• Off-road trail parallel to Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. This area is currently pasture lands and in its current condition is not at all sensitive habitat.</li> <li>• Perimeter of Giacomini Ranch</li> <li>• Perimeter of marsh</li> <li>• Periphery of wetlands</li> <li>• Perimeter path to be safely away from the roadway where possible.</li> <li>• Run across Green Bridge and along Levee Road</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

<b>General Topic</b>	<b>Specific Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Public Access (Cont.).</b>	<b>Southern Path: Point Reyes Station to Inverness Park (Continued)</b>	
	<b>Destination</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inverness Park</li> <li>• At least Inverness Park</li> <li>• Just north of Lucchesi residence</li> <li>• Paradise Ranch Estates</li> <li>• Drakes View Drive</li> <li>• Extending as far north from Inverness Park as feasible.</li> <li>• Inverness</li> <li>• Connect communities surrounding project</li> </ul>
	<b>Path Infrastructure and Design</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefers path to be of eco-friendly materials such as that used at the Red Barn, which is a mixture of decomposed granite and pine resin.</li> <li>• Permeably surfaced.</li> <li>• Dirt</li> <li>• Decomposed granite with boardwalk sections</li> <li>• Trail should be at grade level.</li> <li>• Physically separated from the highway by guardrails.</li> <li>• Safe, yet aesthetically pleasing barrier between users and passing cars.</li> <li>• Maximum of 6 feet wide.</li> <li>• Narrow lanes to slow traffic and create space for an adjacent pathway.</li> <li>• Route may require some minor incursions into NPS's Giacomini Ranch property where passage within the right of way is impossible. These should be balanced against benefit of educating park visitors about wetlands without building more parking lots or access points.</li> <li>• Should be done with the greatest care for recovering habitat and wetland inhabitants.</li> <li>• Least harm to restoration efforts</li> <li>• Propose that for any riparian habitat destroyed in construction of a pathway between Point Reyes Station and Inverness Park equal or greater amount should be created in pastureland west of Highway 1 north of Olema.</li> </ul>
	<b>Seasonality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why can't the path near Levee Road be permanent instead of seasonal?</li> <li>• The seasonal path near Levee Road should not be called "seasonal," but rather a "weather-dependent" path.</li> <li>• Would the path have year-round access?</li> <li>• The path should be a seasonal trail</li> </ul>
<b>Adjacent Landowners and Effect on Community</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be impacts to Point Reyes Station if there are trailheads near town or observation points.</li> <li>• Noise impacts to neighbors and visitors from large number of cyclists: Bicyclists are noisy and aggressive and are not considerate to residents and have no respect for quiet.</li> <li>• Any through trail would represent huge impacts on the unique character of a small village.</li> <li>• Who would have thought that Park acquisition would foster unwanted building development, commercial and residential, on the sensitive edges?</li> <li>• Trail would become tourist destination and create additional parking problems in town that already has parking and storm drainage problems. A large parking lot with sanitation facilities would need to be provided (barn area)?</li> <li>• Concern expressed about a possible increase in traffic and visitation at the White House Pool area with construction of a bridge and elevated overlook.</li> </ul>	

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

<b>General Topic</b>	<b>Specific Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Public Access (Cont.).</b>	<b>Southern Path: Point Reyes Station to Inverness Park (Continued)</b>	
	<b>Dog</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be dog access along southern trail system on the East Pasture.</li> <li>• There should be limited access for dogs.</li> <li>• Dogs should be leashed.</li> </ul>
	<b>Other</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed path ends in Inverness Park, leaving a treacherous stretch of many miles, so that doesn't do me any good until there is another, broader solution to the bike path problem.</li> </ul>
	<b>Railroad Path</b>	
	<b>General Support of Path</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no safe road for local horseback riders to get to the Park. This trail would provide safe passage. This would be primarily for the benefit of local horseback riders, not people who can trailer their horse.</li> <li>• Use of the railroad grade could be " a very light usage and in keeping with the historical nature of the site."</li> <li>• This path is on the developed edge of the wetlands and does not intrude into sensitive areas. Pedestrians on the railbed have no increased access to sensitive areas. How will footpaths on the berm hurt anything?</li> <li>• The cost/benefit ratio is hugely favorable. The roadbed is there, free, and staying.</li> <li>• Supportive of trail as long as it does not undercut natural values.</li> <li>• Unused railroad rights of way are important public resources that ought not to be abandoned without input from the community – not simply the immediate neighbors.</li> <li>• A portion of the old railroad right-of-way needs to be considered as a trail due to its historic aspect and cultural importance and potential for wildlife viewing. Precautions to avoid impact to sensitive species absolutely need to be implemented, as well, and a through route would not be supported.</li> <li>• We ask this because this short path can eliminate the dangers now faced by local hikers, bikers, riders in trying to navigate the edge of Highway one to get to the Tomales Bay Trailhead north of Point Reyes Station. Creation of this path means safety for our kids and us.</li> <li>• This access will be a tremendous addition to the recreational opportunities and safety of the area.</li> </ul>
	<b>Study and Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a discussion of the abandoned railroad right of way.</li> <li>• There should be a study of the potential for a Railroad Path</li> <li>• Not been adequate opportunity for effective public discussion of the issue.</li> <li>• Hire a facilitator to deal with this issue.</li> </ul>
<b>Generally Against Path</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trail "would fragment the riparian-marsh-transition zone and compromise the restoration goals." The riparian forest that covers the Point Reyes Bluff along the east bank of the current route of Tomasini Creek provides the most extensive riparian habitat within the site. Riparian area is protected by the Marin County Zoning Code and the Local Coastal Plan.</li> <li>• Circumscribing the wetland with urban recreational activities leads to intrusion and pollution.</li> <li>• There would be major negative impacts to the plants and animals here by constructing a path. In addition, there would be additional impact by people and domestic animals using this path....This is one location where I believe the mission of resource protection and restoration must have priority over visitor use.</li> <li>• The ARROW was constructed with a century-old lack of environmental sensitivity; studies should be directed to more feasible routes.</li> <li>• There is no existing path, and a new one should not be introduced.</li> </ul>	

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

General Topic	Specific Topic	Comments
<b>Public Access (Cont.).</b>	<b>Railroad Path (Continued)</b>	
	<b>Target Users</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bicycles and pedestrians</li> <li>• Pedestrians only; no dogs – leashed or unleashed – horseback riders, or bicyclists.</li> <li>• Pedestrians only.</li> <li>• Pedestrians, bikes, and horses.</li> </ul>
	<b>Type</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dirt</li> </ul>
	<b>Other</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could there be access on the inside berm of Tomasini Creek?</li> <li>• To protect this continuous habitat, the abandoned railroad right of way should not be used as a trail, but instead should be reconfigured where possible to eliminate the easy level grade access for predators and innocent disturbers.</li> <li>• Conflicts with private property owners could be resolved through vegetation and fencing.</li> </ul>
	<b>Other Potential Trail Alignments</b>	
	<b>Green Bridge-Levee Road Alignment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any talk of narrowing Levee Road to create a bike/walking path?</li> <li>• Replace the proposed Point Reyes Station-Inverness Park trail alignment with one that would use the existing Green Bridge, run along Levee Road, and then connect to the County Park path and then run along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard to Inverness Park.</li> <li>• Using the Green Bridge and Levee Road will minimize the potential for a bridge at the old summer dam location to be lost if the creek jumps its course.</li> <li>• If needed, establish bike path along Levee Road only. Maybe, there could be pedestrian bridges crossing over or tunnels under Levee Road and a path along the side?</li> <li>• NPS should consider a bike path behind the houses along Levee Road next to Lagunitas Creek or in the ROW of Levee Road.</li> </ul>
	<b>Marsh Trail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No path through marsh.</li> <li>• Paths directing people into the marsh is not compatible with resource protection.</li> <li>• No bicycles through the marsh; it would adversely affect the natural resource.</li> <li>• If a path constructed, it should only be for research, nature walks, and maintenance.</li> </ul>
	<b>Other Trails and Public Access Options</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about a path running from the Tomales Bay Trail to Highway 1 along the old railroad grade that runs through Bivalve area?</li> <li>• Against removal of levee/dams/tidgates that would eliminate the foot access to viewing area and the long-time informal path that so many of us have used, enjoyed for years (probably referring to Sir Francis Drake/north levee social path).</li> <li>• Install a pathway between White House Pool Park and the PR Seashore Park’s trailhead at Bear Valley Road. Would require a bridge to carry bicycles, equestrians, and hikes from the Southern Path to the existing Olema Marsh trail.</li> <li>• The Marin Countywide Plan has proposed a combined-use trail going northward along Shoreline Highway to the Park on the old Martinelli property. Logistically, the county trail would serve the equestrian community better since most of their land borders Shoreline Highway.</li> </ul>
	<b>Other Access Comments, Issues and Questions</b>	
	<b>Other Access Issues</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be occasional bicycle/pedestrian access to the marsh through development of observation areas or spur trails along marsh.</li> <li>• No airboats</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX A: Summary of comments and questions from the Giacomini Wetland Restoration Project public scoping in 2004.**

<b>General Topic</b>	<b>Specific Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Public Access (Cont.)</b>	<b>Interpretive Exhibits and Overlooks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be very low key and not affect the natural viewing of the habitat.</li> <li>• Overlooks already exist at White House Pool and Tomales Bay Trail.</li> <li>• There should be maximum environmental educational information with exhibits.</li> <li>• Strong misgivings about kiosks (worse, a viewing tower) in such places and urge that such things be reconsidered and reevaluated and, if they must exist, be fashioned with great sensitivity.</li> <li>• The specialness of the marsh, via viewing platforms and changing exhibits of the work in progress, should be made <u>the</u> attraction to the public.</li> <li>• Elevated overlooks at Point Reyes Station and White House Pool only, not northwest levee.</li> <li>• There were concerns about how an elevated overlook near White House Pool might possibly disturb wildlife, and would it be possible to create some type of blind to minimize disturbance.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
	<b>Other Access Questions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does access get high priority for consideration?</li> <li>• Why is there already a fence put in the marsh at the SFD entrance? Is this going to be typical of the people working on the project to put fencing, pink tags, white poles, and leave them?</li> </ul>
<b>Dairy</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is Giacomini a viable dairy ranch, and would it continue to operate in any of the alternatives?</li> <li>• What is the zoning around the dairy facility?</li> <li>• What is the reason for keeping the barn?</li> <li>• When are the cows phased out of Giacomini?</li> <li>• Will there be limited grazing, and, if so, would there be the continuation of limited irrigation?</li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>	<b>Land Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land ownership: state land vs. NPS. Why can't land be joined? Written response requested from both agencies</li> </ul>
	<b>Education and Interpretation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be more uncomplicated information given out about the functions of wetland and riparian zones. People do not know what riparian is. When people understand the value of these ecosystems, they make better decisions about preserving them.</li> </ul>
	<b>Hunting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the north side of that dike [North Levee], hunting is allowed, if the dike comes down, how are you going to prevent it? Nobody will be able to tell where the hunting area ends.</li> <li>• Strongly urge that the Park Service and State Lands manage the federal and state properties with the same set of regulations, which would mean no hunting on the borders of the new wetland.</li> </ul>
	<b>Olema Marsh</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the Audubon Canyon Ranch Board have less concern managing Olema Marsh?</li> </ul>
	<b>Property Purchase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the NPS be interested in purchasing any of the adjoining properties for inclusion in the restoration project? For example, the Lucchesi property?</li> </ul>
	<b>Mitigation Bank</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sierra Club would vigorously oppose NPS agreeing to place additional acres beyond the 3.6 into a mitigation bank for California Department of Transportation (CalTrans).</li> </ul>
	<b>Information Request</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask for the opportunity to review all your correspondence having to do with the Giacomini Park (aka Wetland Restoration).</li> </ul>