

From: [Levitt, Howard](#)
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: question for you
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 6:48:43 PM

What is the "this" you're referring to?

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 3:22 PM, (b)(6) <(b)(6)> wrote:
this does not mean a "minor" change...

-----Original Message-----

From: Levitt, Howard <howard_levitt@nps.gov>
To: Martha (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Cc: <gfergus@ferguslegal.com> <gfergus@ferguslegal.com>
Sent: Fri, Apr 25, 2014 3:17 pm
Subject: Re: question for you

There is absolutely nothing confusing about this - yes, CF EA stands, as does the Presidio Trust PTMP. Howard

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 3:14 PM, Martha (b)(6) <(b)(6)> wrote:
Hi Howard

Thanks for your response

I am even more confused now
by your answer

Are you saying that the 1996 CF EA stands as is?

Thanks Martha

On Apr 25, 2014, at 3:04 PM, "Levitt, Howard" <howard_levitt@nps.gov> wrote:

Trying again. Howard

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Levitt, Howard** <howard_levitt@nps.gov>
Date: Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 2:10 PM
Subject: Fwd: question for you
To: Martha Walters (b)(6) <(b)(6)>, "<gfergus@ferguslegal.com>"
<gfergus@ferguslegal.com>
Cc: Alexandra Picavet <alexandra_picavet@nps.gov>

Hi Martha:

Alex is out today, so I'll reply to this inquiry.

Volume 1, page 9, provides an explanation of why the Presidio was excluded from this GMP. To state it another way, the Presidio, including Crissy Field, has undergone extensive planning in relatively recent years, compared with the overall park GMP, circa 1980. Therefore, these areas are not in need of a planning update as of yet. To your second point, there is no general land use planning processs underway for Baker Beach or Crissy Field. As you know, we and the Conservancy are looking at a how Crissy Field is holding up and meeting visitor needs after 13 years of extensive use; quite different from a land use plan.

Howard

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 1:15 PM, <(b)(6)> wrote:

hi alex,

after taking a first look at the gmp, it is unclear to me why crissy field and baker beach are not being incorporated in this document. both areas are clearly located in ggnra lands.

why isn't crissy field (area a) part of this process?

and if not, are baker beach and crissy field under going some new land use process of which the public is not aware of?

it is very confusing and i am seeking for some clarity here.

thank you,

martha

--

Howard Levitt
Director of Communications and Partnerships
Golden Gate National Parks
howard_levitt@nps.gov
415-561-4730

--

Howard Levitt
Director of Communications and Partnerships
Golden Gate National Parks
howard_levitt@nps.gov
415-561-4730

--

Howard Levitt
Director of Communications and Partnerships
Golden Gate National Parks

howard_levitt@nps.gov

415-561-4730

--

Howard Levitt

Director of Communications and Partnerships

Golden Gate National Parks

howard_levitt@nps.gov

415-561-4730