

From: [Christine Lehnertz](#)
To: [Stephanie Burkhardt](#); [Frank Dean](#)
Cc: [Craig Dalby](#); [Howard Levitt](#); [Karen Washington](#)
Subject: Fwd: GGNRA
Date: Friday, May 23, 2014 2:02:48 PM

Hi Stephanie, Craig, Howard and Frank,

It's time to put together our strategy for the communications that are now coming to me/PWR for the GOGA dog issue.

This morning I've had about half a dozen messages, so it's starting to ramp up.

For previous letter writing campaigns on other high interest issues we've drafted a generic message from me, which the park uses to respond. "The Regional Director has asked me to respond on her behalf..." and I/Karen will forward those messages to the designated park contact to respond.

I'll be back in the office June 2.

Thanks

Chris Lehnertz, Regional Director
National Park Service
Pacific West Region

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

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lynn Miller <(b)(6)>
Date: May 22, 2014 at 10:22:55 PM MDT
To: "Chris_Lehnertz@nps.gov" <Chris_Lehnertz@nps.gov>
Subject: GGNRA

· It has come to the sad juncture that the staff of the GGNRA is proposing to use our federal taxpayer dollars to keep people from recreating in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

· Currently the GGNRA is pushing forward with three separate plans that seek to limit access to areas like Fort Funston, Rancho Corral de Tierra and the Marin Headlands. Two of those plans could be signed off on as soon as this week—the General Management Plan, which would establish zones where the GGNRA could actually prohibit people from doing things like picnicking at most of Ocean Beach; and a rule that would create restrictive and expensive permits for professional dog walkers who people count on to make sure their pets receive appropriate exercise.

· Right now most people in the Bay Area have no idea what's being planned (there has been very little effort by the GGNRA to reach out to the public and gather input). That's why the National Park Service absolutely should not sign off on these plans right now. We need a real meaningful public process that involves the people who are going to be affected. And we want a process that really takes our input into account. The entire community should have the opportunity to participate in this important discussion.

· Unlike some staff members at the GGNRA, we do not believe people and nature are incompatible. We believe we can balance both so that we can protect recreational opportunities and be responsible stewards of our environment like we have been doing in the GGNRA for decades.

· We live in one of the most densely populated urban areas in America. San Francisco is the second most densely populated city in America after New York City. And the people of the San Francisco Bay Area fought hard to establish and protect the area that was founded to provide recreational opportunities to the people of this region. Now the National Park Service, which was entrusted to protect public access, is trying to eliminate those recreational opportunities one by one.

· These are beaches and trails where people have been welcomed for 40 years into the GGNRA. There is no credible reason to start denying access now.

Lynn R Miller

LRM iPad