

From: [bechtell](#)
To: [Aviles, Brian](#)
Cc: [Frank Dean](#); [Howard Levitt](#); [Christine FitzGerald](#); [Corwin Christine](#); [Martha Walters](#)
Subject: Re: GGNRA General Management Plan -- Montara Dog Group
Date: Monday, February 09, 2015 10:35:49 PM

Hi Brian:

Thank you for responding to my letter. I look forward to working with you and the new General Superintendent on implementation of the GMP and DMP in a manner that satisfies all GGNRA users.

Bill

On Feb 9, 2015, at 11:44 AM, Aviles, Brian <brian_aviles@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi, Bill.

Superintendent Dean shared your message with me and asked that I get back to you about the Final GMP. He pointed out your remark that the Montara Dog Group was not listed among the organizations commenting on the DGMP. In checking, I see that your comment letter was indeed received. I can't explain why Montara Dog wasn't mentioned in print. The GMP team certainly reviewed your comments, which were nicely focused, and considered them as we developed the responses that are published in the Final GMP/EIS. You may want to review Volume II, pages 391-448.

One main point we feel the need to emphasize is that the Final GMP does not presuppose the outcome of the Dog Management Plan. In fact, the decision to separate the two plans was intended to allow for greater focus on how to manage dog walking in the park which would have been just one the many issues studied in the GMP. When complete, the Final Dog Management Plan will take precedence over the Final GMP regarding dog walking in the park.

Your comment about being "planned to death" strikes a chord. I'd ask you to remain patient as we establish the framework to manage Rancho Corral de Tierra in ways that work for all of us. Some of it is broad land use planning like the GMP, Fire Management Plan and Interim Trails Master Plan that are behind us. Others will be nitty-gritty stuff like where to put the trash cans and dog waste bags. We will try not to overwhelm you and

your neighbors but we will continue to offer opportunities for you to advise us.

I'd ask you to recall the many community meetings we had on the Coastsides over the course of 6-7 years developing the GMP. There was the spirited meeting at Farallone View School where you introduced us to the interests of the dog walking community with 130 signatures on the petition. None of us who attended will ever forget that. There were also many other lively meetings before and after with the Midcoast Community Council, their recreation subcommittee, guided public walks in Montara and Moss Beach, discussions with the operators of Moss Beach Ranch, Ember Ridge, and Renegade Ranch. We got input from the Sheriff, CalFire, Mr. Lea of Ocean View Farms, and our neighbors in San Mateo County Rec & Parks and State Parks. And we took to heart a lot of sound advice from POST who were the past stewards of the property. We probably had more meetings on the Coastsides than in any other single area of the park covered by the GMP. This practice continues as we've brought in Christine FitzGerald to coordinate NPS activities at Rancho. It has taken all of that to build the shared vision for the place that is expressed in the GMP. I think you'd agree that it's a vision for continuity and partnership rather than dramatic change.

I suggest it's time for us to build upon the vision. Slowly. And we look forward to your continued help with the GMP, Dog Management Plan, or other topics that matter to you and your community.

Brian

Brian A. Aviles

Senior Planner & Landscape Architect
National Park Service - Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Building 201, Fort Mason
San Francisco, CA 94123
(415) 561-4942 office, -4939 fax, (415) 624-9685 mobile

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **bechtell** <bechtell@comcast.net>

Date: Fri, Dec 19, 2014 at 8:00 PM

Subject: GGNRA General Management Plan

To: frank_dean@nps.gov

Cc: chris_lehnertz@nps.gov, Don Horsley <dhorsley@smcgov.org>, Martha Walters <rosewalt@aol.com>, Corwin Christine <christine@greensrc.com>,

Rill Katrina <katrina.rill@mail.house.gov>

Dear Frank,

I am writing to follow up on the telephone conversation last July between you, myself, Chris Lehnertz and Martha Walters. During that conversation Martha and I pointed out serious flaws in the GMP and requested that the sign-off on the GMP

be delayed until those flaws are addressed. As you know, this important document will replace the original GMP from 1980 — 34 years old! It is prudent to delay the new GMP a little while longer, if necessary, to “get it right.” Below are some of my specific concerns:

On November 24, 2011, I submitted comments on the draft GMP on behalf of the Montara Dog Group (MDG). That submittal was not recognized in the final GMP, even though submittals from other dog groups were identified (Crissy Field Dog Group and San Francisco Dog Owners Group) in the final GMP, Vol. II, p. 391. MDG represents over 400 San Mateo County residents who participate in recreational dog walking on GGNRA lands. Our voice needs to be heard. The body of my comments on the draft GMP are attached, and I will be happy to provide the additional attachments if requested.

In those comments I had two major concerns; one was the lack of coordination between the GMP and the incomplete Dog Management Plan (DMP). The GMP presupposes conclusions from the still incomplete DMP, thus compromising the NEPA process for both documents. In addition, the NPS will soon be doing a "Trail Management Plan" and "Master Plan" for the *Rancho Corral de Tierra* unit of the GGNRA. We are being planned to death! Why cannot all of these plans be coordinated?

The other main concern had to do with the “Park Purpose.” I realize that the NPS has a mandate to "conserve park resources and values" and well as to provide for “the enjoyment of park resources and values by the people of the United States."

The GMP treats these goals as being mutually exclusive, when they are not. The GMP (and DMP) are much more restrictive on recreational uses of the GGNRA than is necessary to conserve park resources.

When the final GMP/EIS was issued it was stated on the GGNRA web site that “there is no comment period.” In the abstract of the final DMP, however, it states that the final GMP/EIS “has been distributed to other agencies and interested organizations and individuals for their review and comment.” MDG is definitely an “interested organization,” but we did not receive a copy of the final DMP/EIS for comment.

As you are probably aware, our elected representatives here in San Mateo County — Congresswoman Jackie Speier and County Supervisor Don Horsley, have also expressed concerns about proposed GGNRA policies in this county. A letter from the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors is

attached.

Finally, I do not feel that the outreach to the public was adequate for the GMP. One meeting in January, 2009, was billed as a “workshop,” where after numerous speakers expressed concern about restrictions on dog walking, and after a petition with 130 signatures was presented, we were told that dog walking was not going to be considered in the GMP. The only other meeting was billed as a drop-in open house in Pacifica in September 2011. I do not feel that either of these events satisfied the criteria for formal public hearings appropriate for a document as important and far reaching as this GMP.

If the NPS plans to revise the final GMP based on comments received subsequent to the release of that document, I think that it would be appropriate to provide the public with an opportunity to review the revisions. If the revisions are substantial, a supplemental EIS should be considered.

Yours truly,

Bill Bechtell

President, Montara Dog Group
www.montaradogs.com