

From: [Christine Lehnertz](#)
To: [Frank Dean](#)
Cc: [Martha Lee](#); [Aaron Roth](#)
Subject: Re: Concern about GMP
Date: Wednesday, February 11, 2015 11:33:59 PM

Hi Frank,

I'd like to follow the same transition briefing process that we used when Bill Dickinson recently retired. He came to the regional office with his Deputy, Patrick Gubbins, and met with Martha and me for a couple of hours. We went over a fairly extensive list of issues, which I think will also contribute to development of objectives for a transition management plan (TMAP) that can be conducted for the new superintendent. He and Patrick then met with Program Chiefs on particular topics that needed any special attention.

We're on a little tighter timeframe with you. A few options include Friday, February 13, all morning; Friday, February 20, all day except 10-11am; Monday, February 23, 2:30 or later; Tuesday, February 24, 3:30 or later; or Friday, February 27 before 10:30 or after 12:00.

Let me know which of these options work for you and Aaron, and I'll check with Martha.

I may also be available next Tuesday, February 17 and Thursday, February 19 if some travel plans change. I'll know more tomorrow.

Thanks!

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 Feb 11, 2015, at 6:06 PM, Frank Dean <frank_dean@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi Chris,

Just two emails so far. And one person calling me. Howard and I left her voice mail messages.

Howard is sending over the suggested talking points again this evening to PWR.

I am open to talk about this tomorrow except at 10 am. Hope to close out with you before I leave!

Frank Dean
General Superintendent

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

On Feb 11, 2015, at 4:00 PM, Christine Lehnertz <chris_lehnertz@nps.gov> wrote:

Sorry, launched before finished.

...particularly if the GOGA and PWRO front offices are inundated with calls and emails in the coming hours/days.

We talked on Jan 30th about talking points, etc. and I trust you have worked with Craig to complete and distribute.

Let's double check our signals.

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

On Feb 11, 2015, at 3:56 PM, Christine Lehnertz
<chris_lehnertz@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi Frank and Aaron,

In order to make sure we are prepared for what may be another communication campaign from interested groups and parties, I'd like a conversation first thing tomorrow about how we'll respond. In particular, if thr

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: dave415
<(b)(6)>
Date: February 11, 2015 at 2:51:14 PM PST
To: Christine Lehnertz
<chris_lehnertz@nps.gov>
Subject: Concern about GMP
Reply-To: dave415
<(b)(6)>

Chris,

I am writing about your office's handling of the GMP and to get a better understanding of the review process, as well as share some observations.

It appears that after being delayed for nine months you signed the same version of the GMP on Jan. 30 that had been handed up to your office in April 2014. This despite major objections registered by a broad section of the public during that time frame, as well as what I believe were reasonable, constructive and balanced solutions offered to the GGNRA by people in the community, including me, and by civic leaders, including Congressman Jared Huffman who requested the removal of two controversial points about parking elements in Marin.

Is it possible to learn what type of review took place, who was involved and what changes, if any, were made to the plan between April - Jan? Please help me out if I am mistaken and that there were changes to the plan. To be clear, I am not asking about clarifications added to the plan that have no bearing on the original language that seems to be untouched.

It is extremely difficult for me to understand who within NPS is responsible for managing public input, how it is considered, and how it is incorporated into a plan or, as in this situation, completely dismissed. For example, why was

"recreation" not added as a guiding principle for a plan that governs all policy of a National Recreation Area (pages 7-8, GMP)? That just seems to me to be a reasonable and logical request that if accommodated would have gone a long way.

I also want to share what I feel is questionable professional behavior by the GGNRA. For the past 2-1/2 months representatives of Save Our Recreation met with the GGNRA management, per your direction. We participated in good faith and made every effort to work collaboratively by submitting suggested changes to the plan, as well as questions about its development, as instructed by Superintendent Frank Dean and Howard Levitt. On multiple occasions we had offered to meet further and inquired about when we could expect to get answers to how the plan was developed -- each time we were told our concerns were being considered, even as recently as Feb. 5. Well, it turns out that was not the case. The plan was signed Jan. 30 and we hurriedly received an email with responses to our questions on Sunday, Feb. 8 just hours before a press release was issued Feb. 9 about the GMP.

Furthermore, in the initial meeting on Dec. 17 we were told that the boards of supervisors in San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo had been briefed on the plan. However, in our recent interaction with supervisors and their staffs in San Francisco, not a single office was able to confirm they had been briefed by GGNRA about the key aspects of the plan, such as the new special zones that will be created throughout the GGNRA. If such briefings did not take place I think there is a serious credibility issue that warrants your attention.

This experience is exactly what I had feared and in my opinion a prime example of how the GGNRA did not genuinely engage with park users and neighboring communities or incorporate public input. The GMP is a major shift in managing policy and the widespread concern is simply not going to vanish.

I would appreciate any response you're willing to provide or have you escalate these concerns as appropriate.

Sincerely,
David Emanuel

(b)(6)

From: "Lehnertz, Christine"
<chris_lehnertz@nps.gov>

To: dave415

(b)(6) >

Sent: Thursday, June 26,
2014 10:25 PM

Subject: Re: Request to
meet with you, status of
GMP

Hi David,

Wanted to drop you a quick note this evening to let you know that I received your email and saw your posting on Facebook. I regret that I can't respond to all of the messages and phone calls that I have received recently about the GGNRA General Management Plan, since I know that people write because they love the public lands that make up Golden Gate. You caught me just as I'm finishing work tonight, and I couldn't log off without responding. We're both up late, doing the things we care about for places that we enjoy.

I am working with Superintendent Frank Dean, the staff at GGNRA, and staff here in the regional office, on the next steps for the record of decision. As the National Park Service develops General Management Plans (GMPs) at parks across the country, there are many steps involved. That includes public involvement opportunities, gathering public comments, and analyzing them. I have reviewed the analysis of comments received during the initial scoping and formal public comment periods for the GMP, and have also reviewed recent communications relative to the GMP and several other planning activities that GGNRA is

On Thu, Jun 26, 2014 at
9:53 PM, dave415

<(b)(6)>

wrote:

Christine Lehnertz
Regional Director
National Park Service

Dear Director Lehnertz,

Two weeks ago I wrote to you, like many others, with serious concerns about the General Management Plan. I also posted a note on your Facebook page about these concerns that received more "likes" than any other post on your page. Today, I am writing to understand your timetable and decision process for signing the decision of record. My request is that you meet directly with a cross-group of frequent visitors to the GGNRA recreational units to address the concerns before taking any action.

Last week at a meeting in Mill Valley about the Muir Woods traffic and parking plan there were numerous questions about the General Management Plan, specifically what outreach was undertaken and how many public comments were considered by the GGNRA. The response by the ranger who fielded the question was vague and uninformed at best. And, quite frankly, if his answer is the extent of the outreach conducted there are legitimate risks that should concern you. Foremost is how an urban recreation property that attracts 15 million visitors only considered slightly more than 500 comments submitted by the public.

Is it possible to meet with you for a constructive discussion about what's taking place and how

people are reacting to the plan that has been set forth? I have no doubt that by a greater ratio -- and growing -- there are more people who have expressed concerns about the plan in the past two months than the number who weighed in during the GGNRA comment period.

I would appreciate a response at your earliest convenience. If you are not able or unwilling to meet, I ask that you escalate my request to a National Park Service deputy director. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

David Emanuel

(b)(6)
San Francisco, CA 94131

(b)(6)

(b)(6)