

From: [Darla Sidles](#)
Cc: [Frank Dean](#); [Howard Levitt](#); [Brian Aviles](#); [Nancy Hornor](#); [Alexandra Picavet](#)
Subject: Re: Thank you and followup
Date: Wednesday, July 23, 2014 9:01:16 PM

Now that we have been instructed on the purpose of the Superintendent's Compendium...

Don't we already address her concerns re: the "zone confusion" in the FONSI? The Dog Plan will delve further into specifics, so that's not an issue with the GMP.

Don't really see much issue with any of her comments, unless I'm missing something.

D

Darla Sidles
Acting Deputy Superintendent
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Fort Mason, Building 201
San Francisco, CA 94123
(415) 561-4723 office
(520) 300-0106 cell

On Jul 23, 2014, at 5:48 PM, "Picavet, Alexandra" <alexandra_picavet@nps.gov> wrote:

Wow. What a lecture.

Wow.

Alex

Alexandra Picavet
Public Affairs Specialist
Golden Gate National Parks
alexandra_picavet@nps.gov
415-786-8021 mobile
www.nps.gov/goga

On Wed, Jul 23, 2014 at 5:41 PM, Frank Dean <frank_dean@nps.gov> wrote:

Have not read this yet...

Frank Dean
General Superintendent
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
201 Fort Mason
San Francisco, CA 94123
(415) 561-4720

Begin forwarded message:

From: <(b)(6)>
Date: July 23, 2014 at 2:10:53 PM PDT
To: <chris_lemnertz@nps.gov>, <frank_dean@nps.gov>
Cc: (b)(6)>
Subject: Thank you and followup

Dear Chris and Frank,

Thank you for taking the time from your busy day yesterday to speak with Bill and me. We greatly appreciate it.

And just a bit of followup with you Chris about how we understand each National Park Service unit is managed.

Although there have been several acts of Congress governing the National Park Service (1916 Organic Act, General Authorities Act of 1970, etc.), it is recognized that each unit of the National Park system is unique. For that reason, each unit has specific local regulations established under the Superintendent's discretionary authority under Title 36 CFR. These management policies and rules are compiled annually in the "Superintendent's Compendium" and can either strengthen or relax generic NPS regulations. There is nothing preventing the inclusion of a provision to allow dog walking in the GGNRA in situations where it might not be appropriate in a National Park.

Moving Forward:

We encourage the GGNRA to take a step back and reissue the GMP as a Supplemental EIS document and address the concerns about public outreach and comment, clarifying the zone (s) confusion (i.e., Ocean Beach, Ft. Funston, etc.), and remove the language regarding the "development" of Four Corners, Santos Meadows and Whitegate Ranch. These are the areas that the GGNRA has promised that were no longer in consideration at their June 2014 Muir Woods Transportation Plan public meeting. We are aware that Congressman Huffman and Marin Board of Supervisor Kate Sears wrote letters to you Frank strongly requesting the GGNRA to address this issue and remove this specific language in the document. And of course, recognizing the GGNRA as it was congressionally mandated: as an urban recreation area.

We hope that the GGNRA will research and consider the Boulder Colorado Green Tag Program as a model to use in managing dog use in GGNRA lands. The Green Tag Program is very successful and we think it will work well on GGNRA lands, especially if the GGNRA partners with organizations like the SF SPCA, ACC and the Marin Humane Society. There is a ton of opportunity here for success.

I think that we are a bit unclear about how these three planning documents

(GMP, DMP and Rancho Trail Plan) would be
"aligned" but remain open and positive about moving forward.

Again, thank you both for your time and for listening to us.

Best Regards,

Martha