

From: (b)(6)
To: Chris_Lehnertz@nps.gov
Cc: karen_washington@nps.gov
Subject: Please keep Recreation in the Golden Gate National RECREATION Area
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2014 8:40:11 PM

Dear Ms. Lenertz,

I am extremely concerned about the efforts that are being made to limit recreation in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

The General Management Plan seeks to provide a "backwoods" and "solitary" experience to visitors to the GGNRA, and the emphasis everywhere in the document is that nature and recreation cannot coexist. This is untrue, and deleterious to the health and well-being of hundreds of thousands of residents in the Bay Area, for whom the GGNRA was created.

According to Congress, the GGNRA was to be a **"new national urban recreation area which will concentrate on serving the outdoor recreation needs of the people of the metropolitan region [with the objective] to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available in this region"** (emphasis added) (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session [1972]).

I understand that the General Management Plan is being considered for approval, and I ask that you reconsider approval at this point, and permit this plan to be brought before the people for discussion. The General Management Plan could severely and unreasonably limit recreational access to the GGNRA, while this is the primary purpose for which the lands were allocated.

The "interim" dogwalker rules are also untimely. There is no need to rush into a bits-and-pieces "run it up the flagpole and see who will salute it" implementation of rules which have not been discussed with either the professional dogwalkers who walk with their pooches in the GGNRA or the San Francisco, San Mateo or Marin political leaders, all of whom have expressed concern and/or opposition to these hastily created and even more hastily to be implemented rules. These rules will affect people's livelihoods, negatively impact local parks, and the well-being of the companions of thousands upon thousands of Bay Area residents.

The Dog Management Plan, opposed by the vast majority of the respondents who submitted their comments, was barely changed between the first draft plan and the second supplemental plan. We wait with trepidation to see how the NPS responds to our most recent comments. Given that the "interim" professional dogwalker rules are being rushed through, unless you object, we fear that the people are once more being ignored, and a small group of NPS staff are making decisions which do not reflect the requirements and

history of the GGNRA, or the needs and wishes of the citizens who have walked on this land for the past decades, even prior to the creation of the GGNRA.

There is no reason to deny recreational access in the GGNRA; recreation and nature are not incompatible.

Please take no action on these plans as they are presently constituted. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. Renée Pittin

San Francisco