

From: (b)(6)
To: [Lehnertz, Christine](#)
Cc: [Howard Levitt](#); [Michael Savidge](#); [Gary Fergus](#)
Subject: Re: GGNRA Draft Rule for Dog Management
Date: Wednesday, August 12, 2015 8:20:55 PM

hi chris,

upon reflection, i wanted to follow up with you about two items from your email.

first, when you say that there will be public meetings during the public comment period for the proposed rule, i hope that they will be meetings in which everyone can gather together and not an open house style meeting. we have had terrible experiences with open house type meetings in the ggnra; bill bechtell and i discussed this with you and frank dean last july regarding the ggnra's gmp and the dog mgt plan open houses. we think a public meeting type workshop meeting is more productive and everyone can discuss and hear all of the public's concerns.

and second, i am curious to know by what you mean by "current conflicts" in regard with the dog mgt plan/rule. if you are speaking about specific visitor use experience with dogs or with humans, our research of ggnra law enforcement data throughout the years clearly identifies that there is much more human conflict than dog conflicts. that is a fact. so, it would be helpful if you could articulate the specific "current conflicts".

thanks, martha

On Tue, Aug 11, 2015 at 8:59 PM, Martha Walters (b)(6) > wrote:
hi chris,

thank you for your response. we appreciate your willingness to have public meetings during this public comment period and to reach out to the various groups.

i hope that you understand that when we request such an extension of time for the public comment period that we want all members of the public to have an understanding of alternatives and solutions to this complex land use issue. i am sure that there will be a lot of information for us to consider and evaluate from the proposed rule.

i for one, appreciate your thoughtfulness in this approach and your consideration of extending the public comment period.

martha

On Tue, Aug 11, 2015 at 6:46 PM, Lehnertz, Christine <chris_lehnertz@nps.gov> wrote:
Hi Martha,

Thank you for your email messages regarding the inquiry and request from Crissy Field Dog Group on the public comment period for the proposed rule for dog management.

The proposed schedule on the GGNRA website is meant to provide information and transparency to the public regarding our expected schedule for completion. We will take into consideration many factors in deciding on the final length of the public comment period, including the CFDG request.

The publication of the proposed rule will include information on the official public comment period.

Please know that we will also include public meetings as a part of the public comment period, so that we can meet in person and share information and hear from individuals throughout the GGNRA and surrounding counties and communities. We will also outreach to groups and sit down and talk about the specifics of the proposed rule and opportunities to work together in the future to achieve a plan that provides a wide variety of recreational experiences and reduces current conflicts. CFDG will be one of the groups that we want to talk to throughout the public comment period.

Thanks again.

Chris

Safely, for the Centennial!

Chris Lehnertz, Superintendent
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Muir Woods National Monument
Fort Point National Historic Site
Fort Mason, Building 201
San Francisco, CA 94123

(w) [415-561-4720](tel:415-561-4720)



On Fri, Jul 17, 2015 at 11:14 AM, Martha Walters <(b)(6)> wrote:
Hi Chris,

On behalf of the Crissy Field Dog Group, its members and board, we would like to request a 180 day public comment period for the GGNRA's Draft Rule for Dog Management that is scheduled to be released in early Fall 2015.

The proposed schedule on the GGNRA's planning website identifies a 60 day public comment for the review of this critical document.

CFDG believes that we will need this amount of time not only to have our experts review and comment but give the public time to absorb and prepare comments that we sure hope that the GGNRA/NPS truly consider and integrate into the GGNRA's Dog Management EIS and Final Rule.

To date, the GGNRA/NPS has NOT done a good job of truly considering the public's concerns and has not acted in good faith in this NEPA process. As a matter of fact, NEPA strongly encourages the primary federal agency work closely with a variety of stakeholders in this process and unfortunately, we have found that NOT to be true.

The GGNRA/NPS appears to be stuck in their restrictive proposals to date without any

scientific or legal basis and unwilling to listen to the public who is clearly in favor of retaining the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy and the existing additional lands in San Mateo county.

It would be helpful if you could respond to this request soon (this is our second time doing so) and give us a two week advanced notice of when the Draft Rule will be released to the public.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Martha Walters