

Responses to Comments

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to analyze the substantive comments given to the Seashore by the public (see below). The Final EIS is meant to be an accurate analysis of impacts of each alternative. Public and agency review of the draft helps to ensure quality. Analysis of comments allows NPS to identify the public's opinion on the adequacy of the document, collect new information on resources, alternatives and environmental issues. The Seashore used public comments to review the alternatives, supplement/improve/modify impact analysis, correct factual errors and clarify information presented in the draft version.

This section is divided into four subsections: Introduction, Commenter Index, Agency and Sample Comments, and NPS Response to Comments. As described above, during the comment period, the NPS received a total of 1,980 pieces of correspondence, containing 4450 individual comments. Form letters constituted 57% of the emails comment letters received. Ninety-four percent of the comments were sent in by individual members of the public. Many of these comments were highly similar or exact duplicates of others. Each comment was read and assigned a Topic Code number. Similar comments received the same code number. This allowed NPS staff to respond once to a comment or concern that several people shared. The commenter index, posted on the Seashore website, allows each person to locate responses to their particular comments.

All comments, as well as attachments and included materials, were reviewed and considered. Where warranted, the draft EIS was revised to reflect edits recommended by commenters or to clarify text questioned by commenters. Responses were prepared for all substantive comments raised by the public and agencies. Substantive comments are defined for the purposes of an EIS as those that raise, debate, or question a point of fact or policy. Substantive comments do one or more of the following:

- question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the EIS.
- question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of environmental analysis.
- present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the EIS.
- cause changes or revisions in the preferred alternative.

Comments in favor or against an alternative, or comments that only agree or disagree with NPS policy are not considered substantive. Comments were either responded to individually or with a response that addressed the concerns of several commenters made on a closely related topic. Such concerns, each one summarizing a substantive comment found in one or more letters, are identified by a unique Topic Code number.

Commenter and Correspondence Indices

An index matching each commenter with a Correspondence ID number, a unique identifier for the letter, email or fax submitted by each individual or organization, has been posted on the Seashore website (<http://www.nps.gov/pore/pphtml/documents.html>). This Commenter Index is arranged alphabetically. A second index matching the Correspondence ID to one or more Topic Codes is also posted at the website (Correspondence Index). Several Topic Codes are listed after a Correspondence ID if the commenter included more than one substantive comment in his/her letter. Topic Codes, each with its corresponding NPS response, follow in the NPS Response to Comments section.

Agency and Sample Comments

The following is an index of all organizations that submitted comments on the plan, along with the Topic Code(s) which represent the substantive comments within those letters. Again, a larger index which includes all individual commenters, is posted on the Seashore website. All responses are found in the Response to Comments section, at the end of this chapter. All submitted comments, as well as attachments and included materials, are available for public perusal in the administrative record.

Organization Name	Topic Code
Audubon Canyon Ranch, Cypress Grove Research Center	AL1400 AL1500 WH2000 WH4000
California Cattlemen's Association	AL1500
California Department of Fish and Game	AL1500 WH2000
California Native Plant Society, Marin Chapter	AL1400 AL1500 AL1110
California State Parks	AL1500 WH2000
California State Parks, Natural Resources Division	AL1500
Friends of the Folsom Zoo, Inc.	AL5000
House of Representatives, US Congress	AL4300 PN8000 PN8000
In Defense of Animals	AL1410 AL2000 AL4000 AL4400 AL5000 GA3000 PN8000 TE4000 WH1000 WH2000 WH4000 WV 1000
Marin Audubon Society	AL1400
Marin Conservation League	AL1500
Marin Humane Society	AL4400
Marin Municipal Water District	WH1100 WH2000
Marin Peace and Justice Coalition	AL1100
National Humane Education Society	AL5000 AL2000 AL5000

Chapter 5 – Consultation and Coordination

	GA3000
National Parks Conservation Association	AL1110
	AL1210
	AL1310
	AL1400
	WH4000
Natural Resources Defense Council	AL1400
People for Golden Gate National Recreation Area	AL1110
	AL1210
	AL1310
	AL1500
	PO4000
Planned Feralhood	AL2000
	AL4300
	WH1100
Point Reyes Light	AL1510
	GA3000
Point Reyes Seashore Ranchers Association	AL1200
	AL1300
	WH1000
	WH4000
Point Reyes Bird Observatory Conservation Science	AL1500
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters	AL1210
	AL1310
	AL1500
Sierra Club	AL1500
	WH2000
	WH4000
Sierra Club Marin Group	AL1110
	AL1500
	AL4500
	PO4000
	WH4000
Sonoma-Marín Cattlemen's Association	AL1110
The Environmental Action Committee of West Marin	AL1500
The Humane Society of the United States	AL1100
	AL1101
	AL4000
	AL4100
	AL4300
The Jane Goodall Institute	AL4000
	AL4300
	AL4400
	AL5000
The Science and Conservation Center	AL4000
Voices for Animals	AL4400
Wildlife Fawn Rescue	AL4500

Chapter 5 – Consultation and Coordination

Because of the volume of correspondence received during the public comment period, this document cannot include all comment letters. All substantive comments found within all correspondence were responded to as described above. NEPA requires NPS to reprint any federal, state or local agency, or tribal letters of comment. They are reprinted in the following pages, with a sample of non-agency letters - an example of the two most commonly received form letters and some letters containing multiple substantive comments representative of various viewpoints.