From: Aviles, Brian
To: Frank Dean
Cc: Levitt, Howard; Nancy Hornor; Steven Ortega; Alexandra Picavet
Subject: Re: Draft Talking points
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 8:36:12 PM

Frank,

I think this is the key sentence you are asking for:

> The language referring to dog walking in the Diverse Opportunity Zone at Fort Funston (Volume I, page 133) was intended to acknowledge some of the popular recreational activities that would likely continue at that site. However, this statement is not a decision about dog walking at Fort Funston. The Dog Management Plan will make decisions about the future of that activity at Fort Funston.

The full ROD language on this topic follows:

Relationship between the General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement and the Dog Management Plan:

> The history of National Park Service efforts to manage dog walking began with the establishment of the park in 1972. A series of interim policies and inconclusive planning efforts led the park to initiate preparation of a Dog Management Plan / Environmental Impacts Statement in February, 2006. Scoping for the general management plan began shortly afterwards, in March 2006, with the understanding that the programmatic general management plan would defer site-specific dog walking uses to the already ongoing Dog Management Plan.
>
> Planning for the general management plan utilized information about the current condition of park and monument resources and developed a set of desired conditions to be achieved and maintained in the future, which is one of the congressionally-mandated roles for the plan. (Volume I, page 57). The desired conditions are elaborated in a spectrum of eight management zones, with guidance for managing resource, the visitor experience, and the general levels of development in each zone. An extensive array of compatible recreational activities is identified for each zone. These are not full lists, as is stated (Volume I, page 63), in part, because the General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement explicitly deferred decisions about dog walking uses to be made in the Dog Management Plan.
>
> In the General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, the National Park Service explained that the plan would not make decisions about dog walking as a use in

the park, and deferred site-specific decisions regarding dog walking to the Dog Management Plan. (Volume I, page 34). The General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement also states on the same page that the National Park Service could make "minor" adjustments to the General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement based on the outcome of the Dog Management Plan, which will not be completed for at least another year. In the *'Comments on, Changes to, and Responses to Comments'* section of the plan, the National Park Service further clarifies the relationship between the General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement and the Dog Management. This language, in Volume II, at page 399, more clearly communicates the relationship between the two plans: "the GMP and dog management plan are separate and distinct planning efforts; if real or perceived inconsistencies are found, the final dog management plan would take precedence over the GMP for this particular use." The National Park Service will apply this language in the event there are any inconsistencies between the two plans.

The language referring to dog walking in the Diverse Opportunity Zone at Fort Funston (Volume I, page 133) was intended to acknowledge some of the popular recreational activities that would likely continue at that site. However, this statement is not a decision about dog walking at Fort Funston. The Dog Management Plan will make decisions about the future of that activity at Fort Funston.

Let me know if you see a problem in this. I plan to "finalize" shortly.

Brian

Brian A. Aviles
Senior Planner. National Park Service
GGNRA - Fort Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123
415.561.4942 office, .4939 fax
415.624.9685 mobile

On Fri, Jul 18, 2014 at 1:44 PM, Frank Dean <frank_dean@nps.gov> wrote:

> Howard,
>
> Thank you, these look good. I don't have my notes from the RD meeting handy, but I recall she wanted guidance on the zoning discrepancy in that we list dog walking at Funston but not elsewhere in the GMP. Anyone else recall the specific outcome that Barbara suggested?
>
> Frank Dean
> General Superintendent
> Golden Gate National Recreation Area
> 201 Fort Mason
> San Francisco, CA 94123
> (415) 561-4720

On Jul 18, 2014, at 1:27 PM, "Levitt, Howard" <howard_levitt@nps.gov> wrote:

Frank, et al:

Here are some draft talking points for Chris for the 7/22 Walters and Bechtell call. Send me comments ASAP. Thanks.

Howard

--
Howard Levitt
Director of Communications and Partnerships
Golden Gate National Parks
howard_levitt@nps.gov
415-561-4730

<Talking Points for Walters and Bechtell call.docx>