

**From:** (b)(6)  
**To:** [Chris\\_Lehnertz@nps.gov](mailto:Chris_Lehnertz@nps.gov)  
**Subject:** GGNRA's GMP  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 27, 2014 1:05:02 PM

---

Dear Ms. Lehnertz,

I am a homeowner and property tax payer in San Francisco. I have lived in this beautiful city for almost 25 years. I would like to retire here. This city means a lot to me for so many reasons.

I have also been a professional dog walker for the last ten years. It pays my way to live in this expensive city, barely. I had no problem with the new city license requirements and, in fact, did not need to make any changes to my business in order to comply. I not only agreed with the new law but advocated for it for the last ten years. So, I am not against regulation where it is reasonable. Unfortunately, there is too much in the GMP's DMP that is unreasonable. It is clear to me and many others, the GGNRA is making it so unreasonable that it's unstated goal is to not only rid itself of professional dog walkers, but make it less enjoyable and more difficult for private dog owners as well.

If I want to have a national park-like experience, there are many amazing places to choose from in and around the Bay Area. What I need is a place I can enjoy with my own personal dog in places like Fort Funston. I need a place where I can successfully exercise and socialize my dog groups. I appreciate that I have that now and have been a responsible and respectful steward of these recreation areas. If there are issues within these parks that can be improved upon, I, along with many others, are more than willing to respond. This isn't anything new, as individuals and groups have been responding to these issues for decades now. Of course, with the increase in population and park attendance, issues reemerge and we recommit our efforts. It isn't perfect, but it ain't broke either. In fact, GGNRA lands have been providing what they were intended to provide; "preserving for public use and enjoyment.... to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space...".

I care about these lands. Until now, the current GMP has created conflict and wasted resources that could, if the GGNRA truly wanted, have been used toward protecting and improving these lands with the cooperation and full support of the MAJORITY of its current users. I urge you to listen and respond to this majority by NOT signing the document in its present form and immediately call for a Supplemental EIS in order to address concerns of this majority of stakeholders. Let's work together!

Sincerely,  
Luke Browne

Sent from my iPad