

**From:** [Christine Lehnertz](#)  
**To:** [Frank Dean](#); [Aaron Roth](#)  
**Cc:** [Craig Dalby](#); [Martha Lee](#); [Stephanie Burkhardt](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Concern about GMP  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 11, 2015 7:01:04 PM

---

Sorry, launched before finished.

...particularly if the GOGA and PWRO front offices are inundated with calls and emails in the coming hours/days.

We talked on Jan 30th about talking points, etc. and I trust you have worked with Craig to complete and distribute.

Let's double check our signals.

Thanks

Chris

\*\*\*\*\*

Our NPS 2016 Centennial Goal: "Creating and connecting with the next generation of park visitors, supporters and advocates."

Chris Lehnertz, Regional Director  
National Park Service  
Pacific West Region

(w) 415-623-2101  
(m) 415-652-8811

On Feb 11, 2015, at 3:56 PM, Christine Lehnertz <[chris\\_lehnertz@nps.gov](mailto:chris_lehnertz@nps.gov)> wrote:

Hi Frank and Aaron,

In order to make sure we are prepared for what may be another communication campaign from interested groups and parties, I'd like a conversation first thing tomorrow about how we'll respond. In particular, if thr

\*\*\*\*\*

Our NPS 2016 Centennial Goal: "Creating and connecting with the next generation of park visitors, supporters and advocates."

Chris Lehnertz, Regional Director  
National Park Service  
Pacific West Region

(w) 415-623-2101  
(m) 415-652-8811

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** dave415 <(b)(6)>  
**Date:** February 11, 2015 at 2:51:14 PM PST  
**To:** Christine Lehnertz <[chris\\_lehnertz@nps.gov](mailto:chris_lehnertz@nps.gov)>  
**Subject:** Concern about GMP  
**Reply-To:** dave415 <(b)(6)>

Chris,

I am writing about your office's handling of the GMP and to get a better understanding of the review process, as well as share some observations.

It appears that after being delayed for nine months you signed the same version of the GMP on Jan. 30 that had been handed up to your office in April 2014. This despite major objections registered by a broad section of the public during that time frame, as well as what I believe were reasonable, constructive and balanced solutions offered to the GGNRA by people in the community, including me, and by civic leaders, including Congressman Jared Huffman who requested the removal of two controversial points about parking elements in Marin.

Is it possible to learn what type of review took place, who was involved and what changes, if any, were made to the plan between April - Jan? Please help me out if I am mistaken and that there were changes to the plan. To be clear, I am not asking about clarifications added to the plan that have no bearing on the original language that seems to be untouched.

It is extremely difficult for me to understand who within NPS is responsible for managing public input, how it is considered, and how it is incorporated into a plan or, as in this situation, completely dismissed. For example, why was "recreation" not added as a guiding principle for a plan that governs all policy of a National Recreation Area (pages 7-8, GMP)? That just seems to me to be a reasonable and logical request that if accommodated would have gone a long way.

I also want to share what I feel is questionable professional behavior by the GGNRA. For the past 2-1/2 months representatives of Save Our Recreation met with the GGNRA management, per your direction. We participated in good faith and made every effort to work collaboratively by submitting suggested changes to the plan, as well as questions about its development, as instructed by Superintendent Frank Dean and Howard Levitt. On multiple occasions we had offered to meet further and inquired about when we could expect to get answers to how the plan was developed -- each time we were told our concerns were being considered, even as recently as Feb. 5. Well, it turns out that was not the case. The plan was signed Jan. 30 and we hurriedly received an email with responses to our questions on Sunday, Feb. 8 just hours before a press release was issued Feb. 9 about the GMP.

Furthermore, in the initial meeting on Dec. 17 we were told that the boards of supervisors in San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo had been briefed on the plan. However, in our recent interaction with supervisors and their staffs in San Francisco, not a single office was able to confirm they had been briefed by GGNRA about the key aspects of the plan, such as the new special zones

that will be created throughout the GGNRA. If such briefings did not take place I think there is a serious credibility issue that warrants your attention.

This experience is exactly what I had feared and in my opinion a prime example of how the GGNRA did not genuinely engage with park users and neighboring communities or incorporate public input. The GMP is a major shift in managing policy and the widespread concern is simply not going to vanish.

I would appreciate any response you're willing to provide or have you escalate these concerns as appropriate.

Sincerely,  
David Emanuel  
(b)(6)

---

---

**From:** "Lehnertz, Christine"  
<[chris\\_lehnertz@nps.gov](mailto:chris_lehnertz@nps.gov)>  
**To:** dave415 <(b)(6)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2014 10:25 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Request to meet with you, status of GMP

Hi David,

Wanted to drop you a quick note this evening to let you know that I received your email and saw your posting on Facebook. I regret that I can't respond to all of the messages and phone calls that I have received recently about the GGNRA General Management Plan, since I know that people write because they love the public lands that make up Golden Gate. You caught me just as I'm finishing work tonight, and I couldn't log off without responding. We're both up late, doing the things we care about for places that we enjoy.

I am working with Superintendent Frank Dean, the staff at GGNRA, and staff here in the regional office, on the next steps for the record of decision. As the National Park Service develops General Management Plans (GMPs) at parks across the country, there are many steps involved. That includes public involvement opportunities, gathering public comments, and analyzing them. I have reviewed the analysis of comments received during the initial scoping and formal public comment periods for the GMP, and have also reviewed recent communications relative to the GMP and several other planning activities that GGNRA is currently conducting. This is a deliberative process, and I take it seriously.

Thank you for letting me know your thoughts and concerns, and

Chris

Chris Lehnertz, Regional Director  
National Park Service, Pacific West Region  
333 Bush Street, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94104-2828  
(o) 415-623-2101  
(m) 415-652-8811

**PWR Safety Vision: "We, the employees of the Pacific West Region, commit, unwaveringly to changing our behaviors and actions so that we all go home safely. We do not accept fatalities and injuries of our colleagues. The only way we accomplish the noble mission of the National Park Service is through our relentless attention to working safely."**

<http://www.facebook.com/pacificwestparks>

On Thu, Jun 26, 2014 at 9:53 PM, dave415

<(b)(6) > wrote:

Christine Lehnertz  
Regional Director  
National Park Service

Dear Director Lehnertz,

Two weeks ago I wrote to you, like many others, with serious concerns about the General Management Plan. I also posted a note on your Facebook page about these concerns that received more “likes” than any other post on your page. Today, I am writing to understand your timetable and decision process for signing the decision of record. My request is that you meet directly with a cross-group of frequent visitors to the GGNRA recreational units to address the concerns before taking any action.

Last week at a meeting in Mill Valley about the Muir Woods traffic and parking plan there were numerous questions about the General Management Plan, specifically what outreach was undertaken and how many public comments were considered by the GGNRA. The response by the ranger who fielded the question was vague and uninformed at best. And, quite frankly, if his answer is the extent of the outreach conducted there are legitimate risks that should concern you. Foremost is how an urban recreation property that attracts 15 million visitors only considered slightly more than 500 comments submitted by the public.

Is it possible to meet with you for a constructive discussion about what's taking place and how people are reacting to the plan that has been set forth? I have no doubt that by a greater ratio -- and growing -- there are more people who have expressed concerns about the plan in the past two months than the number who weighed in during the GGNRA comment period.

I would appreciate a response at your earliest convenience. If you are not able or unwilling to meet, I ask that you escalate my request to a National Park Service deputy director. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

David Emanuel

(b)(6)  
San Francisco, CA 94131

(b)(6)

(b)(6)