

From: [Levitt, Howard](#)
To: [Callaway, Jenny](#)
Cc: [Aaron Roth](#); [Frank Dean \(frank_dean@nps.gov\)](#)
Subject: Re: FW: General Management Plan- NPS's failure to listen
Date: Wednesday, February 11, 2015 5:05:37 PM

Hi Jenny:

Nothing new in Cassie Fimrite's note. I will send you the note I had sent to Andrea Buffa last weekend in response to their specific concerns about the GMP. I made it clear there would be no changes in the GMP, because all of their concerns had been adequately addressed in the Final GMP.

Because we knew the off leash stakeholders held the highly preposterous belief that a) the GMP was anti-recreation, and b) the GMP was predecisional we decided to include a statement in the ROD about the relationship between the GMP and the dog mgt plan.

The ROD states the following (p. 24): "In the 'Comments on, Changes to, and Responses to Comments' section of the plan, the NPS further clarifies the relationship between the Final GMP and the Dog Management {Plan}. 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."

It boils down to this- the dog management plan, not the GMP, will determine where and how dogs can use areas of the park - on or off leash.

Call me for more.

Howard

On Wed, Feb 11, 2015 at 1:30 PM, Callaway, Jenny <Jenny.Callaway@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Here we go....

Please help me remember how the DMP is separate from the GMP. Wasn't there an add-on in the ROD, or somewhere else, stating the GMP would be amended to match the DMP if needed after that process was completed???

From: Cassandra Fimrite [mailto:cassandra@marincountydog.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2015 1:08 PM
To: Callaway, Jenny
Cc: Alonso, Scott; ksears@co.marin.ca.us; Leslie Alden
Subject: General Management Plan- NPS's failure to listen

Dear Jenny,

We are very troubled that the National Park Service has signed into effect the General Management Plan without addressing the broad concerns raised by our group, Save Our Recreation, which represents thousands of people in the Bay Area who are opposed to the plan.

As you may know, NPS Regional Director Christine Lehnertz refused to meet with us throughout this entire process despite written requests by Assembly members Marc Levine and Phil Ting that she hear us out, and other efforts by the presidents of the Boards of Supervisors in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo, who joined with Rep. Jackie Speier in May 2014 publicly calling on the GGNRA to keep recreational access as the primary managing policy of the GGNRA.

On Dec. 17, 2014, we met with GGNRA General Superintendent Frank Dean and, per his request, later submitted changes we were seeking to the plan, as well as legitimate questions about how the GGNRA determined re-classifying the majority of land in San Francisco and the Marin Headlands from high visitor usage to low usage. I have pasted our concerns that we submitted to the soon-to-be-retired (to a conservancy) Frank Dean onto the bottom of this email.

We participated in good faith and made every effort to collaboratively offer constructive and balanced solutions. Yet the GGNRA did not address any of our feedback or even provide reasonable answers to our questions, and they simply stated that we "misunderstood" the plan.

Furthermore, both Frank Dean and Howard Levitt, GGNRA director of communications and community partnerships, were disingenuous about the timing of the plan's release and whether the boards of supervisors had been briefed -- they were not briefed contrary to assertions by Howard Levitt.

This experience is exactly what we feared and another recent example of how the GGNRA refuses to engage with neighboring communities or incorporate their input. There is no justification to manage a designated urban recreation area like a remote wilderness when it is in the middle of the second most densely populated area in the country.

Save Our Recreation has raised concerns about the direction of the GGNRA and its planning processes. We strongly feel that these are serious issues that concern a considerable amount of people as evidenced by the almost 10,000 people who have signed our petition seeking action by our representatives, and at the highest levels of the NPS and Department of the Interior.

We would like to reconnect with you about the situation and to see if you are willing to escalate this issue to the Congressman.

Are you available for a call this week?

Looking forward to hearing back,

Cassandra Fimrite

On behalf of Save Our Recreation

Per the request of the GGNRA, we had asked the National Park Service to make specific changes to the general management plan to address the concerns listed below, and the GGNRA management responded that they did not see the need to make any changes:

- We asked them to include recreation as a guiding principle of the plan. Right now there are guiding principles, and recreation is not one of them.
- We asked the NPS to preserve existing visitor usage levels instead of changing most of the GGNRA into zones where visitor usage would be expected to be low.
- We asked that public access should be preserved except under specific compelling circumstances rather than including blanket public access restrictions that align with the management zones.
- We asked the NPS not to change the park purpose. The new park purpose downplays recreation in favor of creating a “national park experience.”
- We asked that the plan clarify under what specific circumstances the GGNRA would employ some of the more severe strategies it lists to restrict public access such as “establishing regulations on visitor activities.”
- We asked that dog walking be included among the activities that are listed as allowed under the plan’s “natural zones” and “diverse activity zones.”

--

Cassandra Fimrite

email: cassandra@marincountydog.org

website: www.marincountydog.org

facebook: www.facebook.com/marincountydog.org



"Working to keep our trails
and beaches dog-friendly in Marin County."

--

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