

From: [Goodyear, Barbara](#)
To: [Christine Lehnertz](#)
Subject: Re: marin ij editorial
Date: Monday, March 16, 2015 10:36:21 AM

Sure Have Karen give me a call. (b)(6).

On Mon, Mar 16, 2015 at 6:42 AM, Christine Lehnertz <chris_lehnertz@nps.gov> wrote:
Hi Barbara,

(b)(5). Would love to compare calendars sometime this week to see what we could set up in the next few.

Thanks

Chris

Our NPS 2016 Centennial Goal: "Creating and connecting with the next generation of park visitors, supporters and advocates."

Chris Lehnertz, Regional Director
National Park Service
Pacific West Region

(w) 415-623-2101
(m) 415-652-8811

Begin forwarded message:

From: Martha Walters <(b)(6)>
Date: March 15, 2015 at 10:44:42 PM PDT
To: Christine Lehnertz <chris_lehnertz@nps.gov>
Cc: <cookab.hashemi@mail.house.gov>, Robert Edmonson <robert.edmonson@mail.house.gov>, Jenny Callaway <Jenny.Callaway@mail.house.gov>, <katrina.rill@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: marin ij editorial

hi chris,

again, it is cfdg's position as well as congresswoman jackie speier, the board of supervisors from marin, sf and san mateo counties in which ggnra lands reside, that the ggnra was established by congress as a recreation area in a major metropolitan area and should be managed as such and not as a "national park experience".

the will of the people should prevail, not an over reaching government agency and their "park partner", the golden gate national parks conservancy who has their own agenda to push out forty years of recreation access in the ggnra.

these are facts, not a perspective.

the pt reyes light also had an opinion piece the other day that also reflects the concerns of thousands of people in the bay area about this deeply flawed gmp.

and again, cfdg continues to request that ggnra/nps suspend the implementation of the ggnra's gmp immediately and work out a viable solution that encompasses true public input and reflect what cfdg and other stakeholders have already expressed but were dismissed by the ggnra/nps.

cfdg still supports aligning the gmp and the dmp as they are inter related.

you have copies of cfdg's letters.

in addition, the ggnra's gmp record of decision has some serious legal flaws.

i will continue to contact you since a replacement for frank dean has not yet been determined by the ggnra.

Thanks Martha

On Mar 15, 2015, at 9:48 PM, Christine Lehnertz <chris_lehnertz@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi Martha,

Thanks for sharing this perspective.

Chris

Chris Lehnertz, Regional Director
National Park Service, Pacific West Region
333 Bush Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94104
415-623-2101 phone
415-623-2380 fax

On Mar 15, 2015, at 8:03 PM, Martha Walters <(b)(6)> wrote:

#

Twitter

Reddit

Pinterest


1
CO
M
M
EN
T

...

[Home](#)

[Editorials](#)

Marin IJ Editorial: Recreation should be focus for GGNRA

 A school group listens to their guide, left, on Wednesday, March 4, 2015, at Rodeo Beach in the Marin Headlands near Sausalito, Calif. A group called Save Our Recreation is criticizing a recently-released

Golden Gate National Recreation Area management plan, saying the plan limits recreation. (Frankie Frost/Marin Independent Journal)

POSTED: 03/15/15, 12:38 PM PDT

1 COMMENT

The

foundation of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is different from that of a lot of national parks.

As its name implies, it is not a monument, a preserve or a park. It was created 40 years ago as a recreation area, an 80,000-acre swath of publicly owned land that provided many recreational opportunities within a short drive of the urbanized Bay Area.

In the wake of the National Park Service's approval of the GGNRA's new master plan comes a chorus of complaints that its focus is more on protection and preservation than recreation. Balancing those worthwhile objectives is not easy, but that should be the goal as the GGNRA builds public support for its planned improvements.

Certainly, many parts of the GGNRA deserve protective measures — everything from saving important areas for native flora and fauna to preserving historical features that are part of the area.

But recreation should not be ignored and not short-changed.

That's the fear of some people who use the park to hike, jog or walk their dogs. It is an issue that's bigger than the longstanding debate over allowing more trails and areas for dogs to run off-leash. That's certainly part of it, but park users are worried that recreation is being cordoned and confined, ignoring the overriding priority of the GGNRA's formation.

Public involvement and keeping a focus on the GGNRA's balance are keys to successfully implementing the updated plan.