

From: (b)(6)
To: chris_lehnertz@nps.gov; frank_dean@nps.gov; scott.wiener@sfgov.org
Cc: (b)(6) (b)(6)
Subject: follow up
Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2014 6:56:43 PM

hi chris,

last week i spoke with frank dean at length about the status of the ggnra's gmp and dmp. i left you a voice mail message regarding this conversation but you never returned my phone call.

frankly i was taken aback by his position about the gmp and the dmp. specifically he stated that:

"these two land use documents are separate plans" when in fact they are very much intertwined
"there is nothing controversial in the gmp"
and "there is no need for a supplemental eis"

as we discussed in the conference call with you, frank and bill bechtell on july 22, 2014, we conveyed our serious concerns to you about the gmp and dmp. cfdg has articulated these concerns in both our gmp and dmp comment letters to frank and of which you have copies.

frank denies that any revision is necessary to the gmp after you had discussed about "aligning" the gmp and dmp documents during this conference call in july 2014. as we discussed, the ggnra is in clear violation of nepa in both of these documents. just the facts.

frank also was dismissive with me in tone about these issues in our phone call. he said that he would read the cfdg letters and get back to me the following day. he has never tried to contact me since that phone conversation.

i also spoke with him about the dmp and about the very viable alternatives for the adaptive mgt plan, such as the boulder green tag program who is hugely successful. frank said that his staff reported to him that it was not successful. he is incorrect. i also brought up the idea of the recreation roundtable that has the endorsement of rep speier and others who see this as a mechanism for the ggnra and members of the public to engage and resolve issues on a consistent basis so all stakeholders can be heard from and issues resolved in ggnra lands. as currently written, the dmp adaptive mgt plan is very punitive and restricted in nature.

the burden of proof is upon the nps/ggnra to provide evidence about significant environmental impact about dogs in the dmp and to date, there is no documentation to support that position other than inherent cultural bias by the nps about dogs recreating in the ggnra.

i am puzzled that a federal agency who manages public lands does not take public comments seriously especially when our nepa experts have been and are providing succinct and accurate input.

nepa specifically encourages dialogue between a federal agency and the interests and concerns of the public. the nps has a distinct record of very limited public engagement, especially in the ggnra, an urban recreation area, located in san francisco, a major urban area where over 9 million people live and recreate on a daily basis.

clearly frank wants to wash his hands of these issues by choosing the easy route but we are not going away quietly.

i am requesting a conference call or a meeting with you, frank, sf supervisor scott weiner and myself very soon to discuss substantive nepa issues that have NOT been resolved regarding the ggnra's

gmp and dmp. we have articulated these concerns in our letters and hope that we can have a meaningful dialogue with you very soon.

martha walters