

Cc: Howard Levitt[Howard_Levitt@nps.gov]
To: Alexandra Picavet[alexandra_picavet@nps.gov]
From: Howard Levitt and Wendy Scheffers
Sent: Mon 5/5/2014 2:02:35 PM
Importance: Normal
Subject: Re: Initial Thoughts
Received: Mon 5/5/2014 2:02:42 PM

We may need to try a different approval route for this, or it is unlikely to meet the timeliness test. Re bcc, nothing nefarious - you should have been a cc...oversight, nothing more. Sorry. Howard
On May 5, 2014, at 5:02 AM, Alexandra Picavet wrote:

Hi Howard.

Just a caution that all opt eds by a park need approval from Washington DC before being submitted. April may be much more open to them than Sue, but she has not lifted that requirement.

Also, I am wondering why I am bcc'd here instead of shown as a participant in this kind of media discussion. Just wondering.

Thanks.

Alexandra Picavet

Public Affairs Specialist
415-786-8021

Sent from iPhone, please excuse typos and made up words my phone inserted

On May 5, 2014, at 12:46 AM, Howard Levitt and Wendy Scheffers <Exemption 6@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Frank, Amy, Greg and David:

Attached is my first draft of an NPS letter from Frank to the IJ Editors. It is meant to provide the NPS view on the increasing chorus that the park is anti-recreation, the recurring chorus that we propose to ban dogs, and the outrageous contention that the Parks Conservancy is anything but a gift to the people of the Bay Area.

I, too, tried not to be overly aggressive or defensive, but I believe that staying on the high road occasionally requires a strong statement that directly challenges patently false claims (not just from Huey, but from many others with personal agendas) against the park and our key partner. Please give me your comments ASAP, and I will work on improving this.

<Letter to editor 0504.doc>

Howard

On May 4, 2014, at 8:47 PM, Amy Meyer wrote:

Dear Frank and Howard,

Greg says I'll be working with David Shaw on my letter tomorrow. I tried hard not to be on the defensive in what I developed with Greg and then edited to what you last saw. I suggest reiterating the facts without rebutting Huey directly. He appears to be trying to stir up the lowest hostile elements and get another smoke

and mirrors battle going. I think “refutation” of what he wrote is not as good as stating everything as factually and positively as possible about some concerns Huey Johnson expressed without quoting him— or he just gets in another shot. People will not have the earlier articles in hand when they read what you write and that’s just fine. We don’t want to get into a paper/electronic battle of letters and columns.

Best,
Amy

On May 4, 2014, at 6:51 PM, Howard Levitt and Wendy Scheffers

<[Exemption 6]@gmail.com> wrote:

Got your letter- thanks! Frank and I are thinking we will want to write a response as well from the NPS - to both refute Huey's nonsense on the idea of the park as anti-recreation and banning dogs, and to defend our closest partner, the Parks Conservancy. Howard

On May 4, 2014, at 2:39 PM, Amy Meyer wrote:

Howard,
Just sent in another program.
Why don’t you ask Greg about Marty Rosen? He’d be good but I don’t know how far we want this to go. I think the donor audience affected by Huey is very very small.

Amy

On May 4, 2014, at 2:18 PM, Howard Levitt and Wendy Scheffers <[Exemption 6]@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Amy: Can't read this attachment on my home computer - will try my NPS computer. In any case, would it make sense to add Marty Rosen or any of the other Rebels to the letter?

Howard

On May 4, 2014, at 1:52 PM, Amy Meyer wrote:

Hi everyone:
Here is my quick rewrite of Greg’s piece, mostly just lopping off 55 words. Don’t know what the IJ limit is for pieces like these.

Understand why Greg is so busy tomorrow!!

Amy

<Response AM to H
Johnson.pages>

On May 4, 2014, at 1:14 PM, Greg
Moore

[Exemption 6](#)@comcast.net> wrote:

Hi all,

Here is an initial
attempt at a response.
It is too long, of course,
and I am not
committed to the
precise language and
am completely open to
what content is
needed. I just thought I
would get the ball
rolling. This approach
imagines Amy as the
author.

I'm sure it could be
condensed and made
punchier.

Thanks all,

Greg

P.S. I am pretty much
tied up tomorrow with
the Presidio Gateway
project and welcoming
the participants for the
upcoming charrette.

From: Howard Levitt
and Wendy Scheffers
[mailto:[Exemption 6](#)@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 04,
2014 11:39 AM
To: Amy Meyer; Greg
Moore; Greg Moore;

frank and diane dean
Cc: Howard Levitt
Subject: Re: What's
going on with Huey?

Dear Amy: Huey's
way off the deep end,
and this deeply
offensive piece
cannot stand
uncontested. Below
is a link to the Fimrite
article. Maybe all of
us can connect by
phone today or
tomorrow to consider
a rejoinder and
refutation of this
malicious nonsense.
Howard

<http://www.sfgate.com/default/article/Golden-Gate-National-Recreation-Area-proposes-5436978.php>

On May 4, 2014, at
10:59 AM, Amy
Meyer wrote:

Dear Howard,

Greg Moore just sent
this nasty screed by
Huey against the
Conservancy. I am
trying to get my arms
around what is going
on and am working on
what I can do to help.

Do you have the
article electronically

that Peter Fimrite did last week? I want to see it for context. Probably that has to wait until tomorrow, but please send it to me as soon as you can.

Thanks,
Amy

Marin Voice: Keep recreation in GGNRA

By Huey D. Johnson
Guest op-ed column

Posted: 05/03/2014
06:45:00 PM PDT

SAN FRANCISCO is being highlighted nationally this year with 600 showings on the nation's TV stations of the lovely film, "Rebels with a Cause."

Produced by Santa Rosa's KCRB and local filmmakers Nancy Kelly and Kenji Yamamoto, the documentary tells the story of the struggle to establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area through the dreams of honorable politicians

and the fast-moving land purchases made by small nonprofits that make up the GGNRA today.

That now-preserved recreation landscape includes 40 miles of seashore landscape reaching from Bolinas in the north, across the Golden Gate Bridge, to San Mateo County in the south. Its history goes back to post-World War II, when with the help of a cooperative Congress the federal government sought to ease urban pressure by providing recreation. Under Chairman Laurance Rockefeller, the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission hired hundreds of experts to study how recreation could improve our stressful urban condition.

Results included establishment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I recall the fund provided \$113 million. Without it there wouldn't be a GGNRA.

The GGNRA is intended especially for workers and retirees, those living in small apartments with no backyards and no place to walk their dogs. In light of the source and purpose of the LWCF money, the current political maneuvering

to end dog walking is absurd. Owners can train, control and pick up after dogs. And there are already clear rules in place with respect to pets in the GGNRA that need to be enforced and supported.

As happens, a nonprofit Golden Gate National Park Conservancy has emerged that wants to limit public use of the GGNRA. This was never the intent or the purpose of the GGNRA. The principal activity of the national parks advocacy group is fundraising, and wealthy donors who are led to believe they are giving to an environmental cause have donated millions of dollars that is given to government.

This is a mistake.

Such groups have wonderful promise as a way of providing volunteers to assist GGNRA needs, but raising money for government isn't sensible. They are overdue in checking out the British National Trust, or the Friend of Austria's Vienna Woods. These two are marvelously successful and they don't send money to government.

Meanwhile, as the parks conservancy skims millions of

dollars from San Francisco regional environmental giving, important environmental nonprofits are starving trying to compete with it to do their more important work. It's the efforts of Earth Justice, 350.org and the Sierra Club that are doing the most to fulfill the dreams of the first Earth Day.

We can't afford to let something like an attempt to ban dogs or restrict access in the GGNRA distract us from the true environmental issues of our day — climate change, fracking, water scarcity — that deserve the vision and leadership of the Bay Area.

True environmental leadership must remain our most important legacy.

We know that the role the GGNRA plays in our regional health and identity is unparalleled. We are obligated to honor its origins, protect its multiple uses, provide a place for hikers, bikers, dogs and kids and show the rest of the country why we deserve to have its bounty so close at hand.

Huey D. Johnson of

Mill Valley is the founder of Resource Renewal Institute, a non-profit organization that deals with environmental sustainability. As director of the Nature Conservancy, he helped save the Marin Headlands from development. He was also the founder of the Trust for Public Land and served as secretary of resources during Gov. Jerry Brown's first term.

<Response to Johnson
Op Ed.doc>