Stephan Nofield
05/12/2006 03:47 PM MDT

To: Patrick Malone/DENVER/NPS@NPS
cc:
Subject: Fw: Request for Admin. Review of NR in the GGNRA; ESA

Stephan J. Nofield, National Park Service, Community Planner, 303.969.2253
12795 West Alameda Parkway, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225-0287
Email: stephan_nofield@nps.gov
----- Forwarded by Stephan Nofield/DENVER/NPS on 05/12/2006 03:47 PM -----

"Suzanne Valente" <smvalente@mindspring.com >

05/09/2006 06:34 AM MST

To <lynn_scarlett@iois.doi.gov>
cc <Stephan_Nofield@nps.gov>, <don_murphy@nps.gov>, <dcrain@sfspca.org>
Subject Request for Admin. Review of NR in the GGNRA; ESA

Dear Secretary Scarlett,

My communication to you is provoked by your column entitled"Tapping the Power of Cooperative Conservation" as published on April 30. It was heartening to read your thoughts regarding the ESA- rational, logical observations coming from a high-ranking government official How refreshing! Your sensibility as well as your position as Acting Secretary of the Interior encourage me to bring up two critical issues for your consideration(and if you are unable to take any action, it would be appreciated if you could make Gov. Kempthorne aware of these matters should he be confirmed by the Senate as the new Secretary of the Interior).

First, I would like to comment in some detail as to the path of the General Management Plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). Accordingly, there are extensive attachments to this email, and I sincerely hope you will pay some serious attention to these comments as they reflect the feelings of many here in the Bay Area who will not be commenting because they are not aware this process is even underway The GGNRA mails information out to a select group of people who ask to be on their mailing list, and their web site is often "down" and can be confusing to navigate. The GGNRA generally fails to post any notices of these processes such as Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) or the General Management Planning at the GGNRA locations people frequent, which would be an obvious way to notify those who have a stake in the decisions being made

There is a clear directive on the part of the GGNRA to remove recreation from the GGNRA. In fact, I have extensive documentation from the Negotiated Rulemaking(NR) process for Pet Management (off-leash recreation) attached because it serves to confirm that assertion rather clearly. (The original/main document about NR is the attached file **GGNRA_AR.pdf**, and the other attachments are all letters, writings,etc. that are referred to in that document). These documents also outline the Congressional mandate for the GGNRA, the enabling legislation, the Memorandums of Understanding and historical and cultural issues relevant to the establishment of the GGNRA Within this same NR process Barbara Goodyear (solicitor for NPS) stood in front of the participants and the audience and advised us that in the eyes of the NPS a court decision regarding bicycling in the GGNRA and the Redwood Act had effectively eliminated the Congressional mandate for recreation opportunities in the GGNRA I actually contacted Paul Hoffman of the DOI and asked if that was the position of the DOI I was advised that it was decidedly NOT the position of the DOI.

Regardless, the GGNRA proceeds as if their only responsibility is to "preserve" the integrity of the park for future generations, treating the park as if it were a wilderness area. Recreation is not a priority, despite the fact that this entire **National Recreation Area** was established to provide ***recreational*** opportunities in an urban environment Furthermore, I would point out that the GGNRA is NOT preserving the park as they found it and a case can be made that they are ***destroying*** the park for future generations. The GGNRA takes new and existing properties, and often without the required environmental review, creates habitat and then utilizes the existence of the habitat to outlaw

recreational activities. For example, at Fort Funston the GGNRA has illegally implemented closures of property to adults, their children, the disabled and pets. The premise of these actions was to rip out all existing vegetation and plant "native plants" to create flyover habitat for the State-protected bank swallow. However, these actions have resulted in a serious decline in the bank swallow population, and the bank swallows have actually moved their burrows *away* from these "habitat" areas. So, instead of preserving the park as they found it, and allowing present and future generations to enjoy the park as the past generations have(which is in theory the NPS directive), the NPS has destroyed the park as they found it and created an outdoor "museum" where the public can only stand behind ropes and barriers and look at what others previously enjoyed.

An example of a new property with a similar fate would be Mori Point in Pacifica. This property has been utilized by Pacificans and Bay Area residents as an area to ride off-road vehicles, or hike (often with off-leash dogs) across rolling hills to reach spectacular vistas of the open ocean. This property was often sought after by developers because it is expansive and offers ocean vistas. The citizens of Pacifica voted these developments down time and again, and eventually a number of citizens went to extraordinary measures and expense to set this property aside to become part of the GGNRA. It seemed there would be no better way to preserve this area permanently for recreational use than to see that it became a part of the GGNRA. The scoping is now being completed at Mori Point by the GGNRA. Once again, the GGNRA is NOT preserving the property as they found it for future generations. Instead plans are to convert most of Mori Point to habitat, allowing the public to walk only on a few roped trails, just looking at the areas that the previous generations used to enjoy. Off- road vehicles and off-leash dogs will be prohibited. Once again, we have an outdoor "museum". To the dismay of many, we now find that like Mori Point, the thousands of acres that have been recently transferred to the GGNRA in San Mateo County will all prohibit off-leash dogs. The enabling legislation for this National Park is being perverted by GGNRA management who care nothing about recreation. The question becomes: Is this the will of the NPS as well? I suggest that if the NPS intends to live up to the promises made of a National Recreation Area here, they had best take a firm hold upon the reins of this Management Plan and exert some control over(or replace) current management. If current GGNRA management is merely carrying out NPS intentions for this National Recreation Area, then our legal experts conclude we will be left with no other option but to pursue litigation. In San Francisco, the deed agreements allow for reversion of several expansive properties if recreation is not respected as the mandated use for those areas.

At this point in time, the GGNRA is setting the stage for elimination of recreational opportunities by claiming publicly that they are underfunded. However, they have chosen to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on litigation (which they lost) to eliminate off-leash recreation in the GGNRA entirely, and they now are spending close to a million dollars on this NR process which is once again intended to eliminate off-leash recreation. The GGNRA is proceeding to eliminate bonfires at the beach as they claim they do not have the manpower to enforce the ban on drinking and littering which often accompanies this activity. Yet they manage to mobilize personnel to harass off-leash dog walkers in areas that are legally off-leash. Please read the attached documents--the story is all there.

Second, I wonder why it is that the USFWS was allowed to maintain the status of the Western Snowy Plover as threatened. The recent decision chose to ignore two genetic studies which determined the coastal plover population is genetically identical to a large inland population. The decision was based upon a determination that the behavior of the coastal plover was different, so this was considered enough to distinguish the two as different subspecies. I graduated with honors in Genetics at UC Berkeley, and I find this perversion of the scientific method offensive. Why was this misguided logic allowed to pass scrutiny of Washington officials? Would it not be preferable to spend the limited resources (of manpower as well as dollars) on recovery of species that are truly endangered? Do you have any idea of the contempt for the ESA this decision engenders? There are between 1500 and 2000 miles of coastline that will continue to implement access restrictions for the public because of this outrageous decision. As for the GGNRA, they will continue to declare Ocean Beach "crucial habitat" (yes, this is a made up designation because it is NOT critical habitat) and use the seasonal presence of the roosting plover on 10% of the beach to ban off-leash recreation on the entire stretch of Ocean Beach year-round.

I just thought I would give another Washington official a try at getting it right. You seem to have the sense to understand the problems I have presented, the only question is do you have the will to address them? I would be most happy to explain anything that has not been made clear. I recognize that in the interest of brevity some of the issues are a bit cryptic. I, and many others, would be truly appreciative if you can find the time to take a close look at the situation here on the West Coast.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Valente
Dr. Suzanne Valente
318 Farallon Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044
650-359-6999 (Home)
650-619-3401 (Cell)

smvalente@mindspring.com

GGNRA_AR.pdf Attachment_M.pdf Attachment_A.pdf Attachment_B.pdf Attachment_C.pdf
Attachment_D.txt Attachment_E(Part 1).htm Attachment_E(Part 2).jpg

----- Message from "Suzanne Valente" <smvalente@mindspring.com> on Mon, 12 Sep 2005 17:01:48 -0700 -----

To: "Powell, Chris" <Chris_Powell@nps.gov>, "Greg Bourne" <GregBourne@ccp.csus.edu>
cc: <gfergus@ferguslegal.com>, "Sayad, Steve" <SSayad@comcast.net>, "Ayers, Ken" <KenAyers8@verizon.net>, "Golub, Steve" <sgolub@mindspring.com>
Subject: Negotiated Rulemaking Committee

Dear Chris and Greg:

I thought I would follow up on our conversation the other afternoon. In our discussion, one of the reasons you brought up for my possible removal from the Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) Committee was my "vitriol". You stated that people who utilized vitriolic, inflammatory speech in their communications would be a disruptive presence and not contribute to consensus. When I asked for an example of my "vitriol", you presented a copy of my letter to the Guide Dogs for the Blind (GDB) organization as posted on the Ocean Beach DOG (OBDOG) web site. This letter was intended to communicate to GDB management that I felt their decision to support the Emergency Petition to ban off-leash recreation in the GGNRA was ill-advised, and most likely made without proper background as to the situation. In the context of that discussion, I termed their decision "ignorant". I still do not find this to be an improper use of the word. You stated this type of rhetoric was inflammatory and would make it difficult for GDB to sit across the table and negotiate effectively with me. When I pointed out that GDB was not on the panel, you said "well, they might be".

In light of your position, I'd like to make you aware of the following e-mail sent by Brent Plater (the Center for Biological Diversity's current NR representative) to the sfanimallaw group which I would consider vitriolic. I should point out that this e-mail went out to the entire sfanimallaw list which at the time was not limited to attorneys. I was on the list as were other OBDOGers.

----- Original Message -----
From: "Brent Plater" <bplater@biologicaldiversity.org>
To: <sfanimallaw@yahoogroups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2005 1:20 AM
Subject: [sfanimallaw] If You Love Your Dog, Leash Your Dog

Folks,

I've added a file to the sfanimallawgroup Yahoo! website which I suspect will be of interest to many of you.

As you may be aware, individuals associated with a group called Ocean Beach
D.O.G. have initiated a challenge to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's leash law. On behalf of a local animal rights organization, two conservation organizations, a local park protection organization, and a child welfare organization, I filed an Amici Brief in this case to explain,
among other things, how running dogs off-leash in the GGNRA-a park that contains none of the safeguards recommended by responsible animal welfare organizations to insure the safety of off-leash pets-has resulted in needless and preventable injuries and deaths to many dogs in the park.

For those of you unfamiliar with Ocean Beach D.O.G., the group's purported
goal is to turn Ocean Beach into a national off-leash recreation area, but
they propose no safeguards to ensure the safety of dogs. If this goal cannot be accomplished, Ocean Beach D.O.G. apparently intends to dismantle
the GGNRA all together:

"We have begun discussions with the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to evaluate the possibility of shifting some of NPS property
to another federal agency more committed to recreational use of these resources. Since these agency [sic] are required to administer their lands
for multi-use, there are formal regulations in place requiring public review
and planning. Furthermore, we believe the city should take back Ocean Beach, Funston Beach, Lands End, Fort Funston and Fort Miley."
http://oceanbeachdog.home.mindspring.com/id21.html

Ocean Beach D.O.G. espouses the extremist theories of the Pacific Legal Foundation, to whom sections of Ocean Beach D.O.G.'s website is dedicated.
PLF is a racist, property-rights law firm that is infamous for filing anti-affirmative action and anti-environmental litigation. I'm sure PLF is
more than pleased that a group purporting to have the interests of domestic
animals in mind, based in San Francisco no less, is helping advance PLF's agenda. Hopefully the courts will stop the impact lawsuits before more dogs
are harmed.

bp

Brent Plater
Staff Attorney
Center for Biological Diversity
San Francisco Bay Area Office
1095 Market St., Suite 511
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: 415-436-9682 x 301
Fax: 415-436-9683
bplater@biologicaldiversity.org
http://www.biologicaldiversity.org

This e-mail message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may
contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review,
use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited by law. If you are not the
intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy
all copies of the original message.

---------- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----------~-->

In this e-mail, Mr. Plater is factually dishonest and additionally accuses the OBDOG membership of espousing extremist theories which include racism. This type of rhetoric would make it difficult for any OBDOG representative to sit across the table and negotiate effectively with any representative from the Center for Biological Diversity (CBD). I should point out that

when an OBDOG member who contributes to CBD contacted them on a personal level to inquire as to whether this type of statement was representative of the CBD viewpoint, the statement was not retracted. Based upon your guidelines, there is undeniable cause to remove CBD from the NR Committee.

You also stated that the OBDOG web site was a reason to remove me (or OBDOG entirely) from the NR Committee. You advised me the content was inflammatory and would preclude consensus in NR. To be more specific, you pointed to the COMMENT FOR NOTICE OF INTENT TO ESTABLISH A NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Having reviewed that posting, I cannot agree. The individuals who contribute to the web site content went through the notice as posted in the Federal Register carefully, noting omissions and issues requiring clarification, as well as pointing out proposed members of the committee whose established opinions would preclude their negotiation in good faith. One of the relevant omissions was the acknowledgment that according to the Federal Court, the 1979 Pet Policy is currently the operative dog management policy in the GGNRA. Accordingly, it should be the starting point for the NR Committee. You have yet to acknowledge the court's ruling for the purposes of the NR, or remove the signs prohibiting off-leash recreation in the areas of the GGNRA affected by the 1979 Pet Policy. Due diligence requires us to point this out.

The groups we singled out on the web site as being unable to negotiate in good faith were chosen because they filed an amicus brief in litigation between the GGNRA and several citizens who had been ticketed for having their dogs off-leash in the GGNRA. Brent Plater (of CBD) filed an amicus brief in this litigation on behalf of these groups, telling another attorney of record (who is also an OBDOG member) that their intervention in the litigation was because he and his clients believed off-leash dog walking should never be allowed in the GGNRA. Their Amici brief was consistent with that viewpoint. This is demonstrable bad faith for participants on the NR Committee. These are all legitimate issues to point out, and in fact, the point of the comment process is to allow the public to apprise you of these issues. We brought these issues up to the GGNRA in the comment period in a good faith effort to see this process proceed in a productive manner. It is our belief if the NR Committee is selected with representatives who are too extreme in their beliefs, and unwilling to compromise, the process will be irreversibly damaged. You may consider off-leash advocates to be extreme, however I pointed out to you that afternoon that there are no off-leash advocates who advocate ALL the GGNRA should be off-leash. Our opposition, however, insists that ALL the GGNRA be off-limits to those wishing to recreate off-leash. It is they who are the extremists. The fact that you object to OBDOG raising these legitimate points begs the question as to whether the GGNRA is entering this process in good faith. In our recent meeting, you failed to address or resolve any of these issues regarding the

NR process.

Subsequent to the comment period's termination, the GGNRA has been presented with an Emergency Petition by a number of groups including, the Center for Biological Diversity, the Sierra Club, Golden Gate Audubon Society, Coleman Advocates for Youth, California Native Plant Society, and the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters. All of these groups are currently seated on the NR Committee. The petition asks that off-leash recreation in the GGNRA be immediately suspended as it endangers people, pets, wildlife and the park itself. It does seem incomprehensible that these assertions are compatible with a mindset that is open to off-leash recreation in the GGNRA. Plainly put, a rational person would conclude that these parties cannot enter these negotiations in good faith, with an open mind, and willing to compromise to establish appropriate off-leash areas in the GGNRA. Good faith on the part of all parties is a requirement for the NR process to be successful. Once again, I and the other panelists brought this up to you, yet never received an explanation as to why you persist in allowing the process to proceed when there are so many parties to NR who clearly want NO off-leash recreation in the GGNRA.

It was pointed out to you by the panelists in our meeting that the express purpose of the Negotiated Rulemaking process is to create a workable Rule to provide for dog management including off-leash recreation in the GGNRA. On the other hand, in his attempts to recruit support for his emergency petition, I advised you that Brent Plater was telling his intended supporters that the Negotiated Rulemaking process was intended to remove off-leash access from the GGNRA permanently. Sierra Club leadership has stated the same in their recent meetings. The afore-mentioned groups who signed the Emergency Petition are all operating under that premise which violates the directive for the NR Committee. We asked that you address that issue, however, you did not.

I and the other panelists corrected you several times when you accused us of litigating against the GGNRA. For the record, the litigation was not initiated by any dog groups, but was the product of several dog owners deciding to defend themselves against tickets issued to them for having their dogs off-leash in the GGNRA. These particular individuals had been aware of the process required by law for the GGNRA to have repealed the 1979 Pet Policy, and in fact, had attempted to participate in it. We supported them as we believed as they did, that the GGNRA had issued their tickets illegally. We were right. It is disturbing to have the GGNRA now treat all off-leash enthusiasts as troublemakers rather than apologizing for having violated our rights. It is oddly disturbing to see that Mr. Plater makes a similar assertion in his e-mail; that OBDOG members initiated a challenge to the leash law. No, individual dog owners decided to defend themselves

against illegal ticketing. It is the American way, is it not?

I do not believe you have good cause to take me off the Negotiated Rulemaking panel; and I think it would be unreasonable to leave a critical area in the GGNRA, Ocean Beach, without representation. I also believe you owe all the participants some answers as to why you tolerate behavior from some participants that clearly violates the good faith requirement for the NR Committee, yet attack others for behavior that can be considered rational expression of a personal opinion. I am disturbed you advised me if I were to be allowed to represent OBDOG in NR, you still intended to remove me at any time throughout this process if you felt that our group's website was posting information that was too inflammatory. The members of our group did not sacrifice their right to freedom of speech in order to participate in this process. I don't have complete authority over what goes on the web site, and I must say I do not find a threat such as this appropriate. I advised you numerous times it is not OBDOG's intent to undermine NR.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Valente

Dr. Suzanne Valente
318 Farallon Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044
650-359-6999

smvalente@mindspring.com


Attachment_G.doc

Attachment_H.pdf

Attachment_I.pdf

Attachment_J.pdf

Attachment_K.pdf

Attachment_L.pdf

Stephan Nofield
05/01/2006 05:03 PM MDT

To: Patrick Malone/DENVER/NPS@NPS
cc:
Subject: Fw: Comment regarding the GMP for the GGNRA

Stephan J. Nofield, National Park Service, Community Planner, 303.969.2253
12795 West Alameda Parkway, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225-0287
Email: stephan_nofield@nps.gov
----- Forwarded by Stephan Nofield/DENVER/NPS on 05/01/2006 05:02 PM -----

"Suzanne Valente" <smvalente@mindspring.com>
04/26/2006 08:45 AM MST

To <Stephan_Nofield@nps.gov>
cc "J. Flinn" <johnflinn@sbcglobal.net>, <don_murphy@nps.gov>, <Gale_Norton@ios.doi.gov>, <Paul_Hoffman@ios.doi.gov>, <Brian_O'Neill@nps.gov>
Subject Comment regarding the GMP for the GGNRA

Dear Mr. Nofield,

I would like to comment in some detail as to the path of the General Management Plan for the GGNRA Accordingly, there are extensive attachments to this email, and I sincerely hope you will pay some serious attention to these comments as they reflect the feelings of many here in the Bay Area who will not be commenting because they are not aware this process is even underway. The GGNRA mails information out to a select group of people who ask to be on their mailing list, and their web site is often "down" and can be confusing to navigate. The GGNRA generally fails to post any notices of these processes such as Negotiated Rulemaking(NR) or the General Management Planning at the GGNRA locations people frequent, which would be an obvious way to notify those who have a stake in the decisions being made.

There is a clear directive on the part of the GGNRA to remove recreation from the GGNRA. In fact, I have extensive documentation from the Negotiated Rulemaking(NR) process for Pet Management (off-leash recreation) attached because it serves to confirm that assertion rather clearly. (The original document about NR is the GGNRA_AR.pdf, and the attachments are all letters, writings,etc. that are referred to in that document). These documents also outline the Congressional mandate for the GGNRA, the enabling legislation, the Memorandums of Understanding and historical and cultural issues relevant to the establishment of the GGNRA Within this same NR process Barbara Goodyear (solicitor for NPS) stood in front of the participants and the audience and advised us that in the eyes of the NPS a court decision regarding bicycling in the GGNRA and the Redwood Act had effectively eliminated the Congressional mandate for recreation opportunities in the GGNRA I actually contacted Paul Hoffman of the DOI and asked if that was the position of the DOI I was advised that it was decidedly NOT the position of the DOI.

Regardless, the GGNRA proceeds as if their only responsibility is to "preserve" the integrity of the park for future generations, treating the park as if it were a wilderness area. Recreation is not a priority, despite the fact that this entire **National Recreation Area** was established to provide ***recreational*** opportunities in an urban environment Furthermore, I would point out that the GGNRA is NOT preserving the park as they found it and a case can be made that they are ***destroying*** the park for future generations. The GGNRA takes new and existing properties, and often without the required environmental review, creates habitat and then utilizes the existence of the habitat to outlaw recreational activities. For example, at Fort Funston the GGNRA has illegally implemented closures of property to people, their children and pets. The premise of these actions was to rip out all existing vegetation and plant "native plants" to create flyover habitat for the State-protected bank swallow. However, these actions have resulted in a serious decline in the bank swallow population, and the bank swallows have actually moved their burrows*away* from these "habitat" areas. So, instead of preserving the park as they found it, and allowing present and future generations

to enjoy the park as the past generations have (which is in theory the NPS directive), the NPS has destroyed the park as they found it and created an outdoor "museum" where the public can only stand behind ropes and barriers and look at what others previously enjoyed.

An example of a new property with a similar fate would be Mori Point in Pacifica. This property has been utilized by Pacificans and Bay Area residents as an area to ride off-road vehicles, or hike (often with off-leash dogs) across rolling hills to reach spectacular vistas of the open ocean. This property was often sought after by developers because it is expansive and offers ocean vistas. The citizens of Pacifica voted these developments down time and again, and eventually a number of citizens went to extraordinary measures and expense to set this property aside to become part of the GGNRA. It seemed there would be no better way to preserve this area permanently for recreational use than to see that it became a part of the GGNRA. After all, the GGNRA is a Recreational Area, is it not? I can personally confirm that Mori Point was used extensively by residents for offleash hiking with dogs. As a member of the Pacifica Animal Advisory Commission, we were charged with recommending to the City the best places the City might set aside as sanctioned for off-leash recreation in Pacifica. Having attended numerous meetings with the public, I can tell you with absolute certainty that the area most utilized by Pacificans for offleash hiking with their dogs was Mori Point. This was at a time when Mori Point had already been transferred to the Pacifica Land Trust, but not yet become a part of the GGNRA. The public was quite concerned about Mori Point's future use, but those involved in the transfer of the property assured the public Mori Point would be indeed reserved for recreational use. Fast forward to today. The scoping is being completed at Mori Point by the GGNRA. Once again, the GGNRA is NOT preserving the property as they found it for future generations. Instead plans are to convert most of Mori Point to habitat, allowing the public to walk only on a few roped trails, just looking at the areas that the previous generations used to enjoy. Off- road vehicles and off-leash dogs will be prohibited. Once again, we have an outdoor "museum". To the dismay of many, we now find that like Mori Point, the thousands of acres that have been recently transferred to the GGNRA in San Mateo County will all prohibit offleash dogs. I should advise you that Pacifica has a population of approximately 40,000, with the number of dogs equivalent to the number of children; about 10,000. Where will they all go--the vast majority of open space in this community has all been turned over to the GGNRA by a misguided City government without a vote of the people. The GGNRA misled the public by virtue of their very name--they no longer have any interest in facilitating recreation within park boundaries. The enabling legislation for this National Park is being perverted by GGNRA management who care nothing about recreation. The question becomes: Is this the will of the NPS as well? I suggest that if the NPS intends to live up to the promises made of a National Recreation Area here, they had best take a firm hold upon the reins of this Management Plan and exert some control over (or replace) current management. If current GGNRA management is merely carrying out NPS intentions for this National Recreation Area, then our legal experts conclude we will be left with no other option but to pursue litigation.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Valente

Dr. Suzanne Valente
318 Farallon Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044
650-359-6999

smvalente@mindspring.com





Attachment_M.pdf Attachment_A.pdf Attachment_B.pdf Attachment_C.pdf Attachment_D.txt


Attachment_E(Part 1).htm Attachment_E(Part 2).jpg

----- Message from "Suzanne Valente" <smvalente@mindspring.com> on Mon, 12 Sep 2005 17:01:48 -0700 -----

To: "Powell, Chris" <Chris_Powell@nps.gov>, "Greg Bourne" <GregBourne@ccp.csus.edu> <gfergus@ferguslegal.com>, "Sayad, Steve" <SSayad@comcast.net>, "Ayers, Ken"

Stephan Nofield
05/23/2006 09:26 AM MDT

To: Patrick Malone/DENVER/NPS@NPS
cc:
Subject: Fw: User Conflicts in Golden Gate National Recreation Area Public Involvement

---

Stephan J. Nofield, National Park Service, Community Planner, 303.969.2253
12795 West Alameda Parkway, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225-0287
Email: stephan_nofield@nps.gov
----- Forwarded by Stephan Nofield/DENVER/NPS on 05/23/2006 09:26 AM -----

Lee Ann Ciancetti/GOGA/NPS
05/15/2006 05:09 PM PDT

To Stephan Nofield/DENVER/NPS@NPS
cc
Subject Fw: User Conflicts in Golden Gate National Recreation Area

---

Lee Ann Ciancetti
Golden Gate National Parks
Upper Fort Mason (Franklin Street @ Bay Street)
Fort Mason Building 201
San Francisco, CA 94123
Lee_Ann_Ciancetti@nps.gov
415-561-4930
----- Forwarded by Lee Ann Ciancetti/GOGA/NPS on 05/15/2006 05:09 PM -----

Mike Vandeman <mjvande@pacbell.net>
04/28/2006 09:38 PM MST

To: goga_gmp@nps.gov
cc:
Subject: User Conflicts in Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Patty Ciesla says "You need to be like the mom, who tells kids they just have to learn how to get along together, to not fight, to be considerate of each other, and to share. There's no reason we can't get along when that's what expected of us. When people think they don't have to share they will want to keep it all to themselves."

First, you should know that Patty, as an officer in ROMP, was caught red-handed re-opening a closed trail. For some reason MROSD officials gave her a break, and didn't prosecute her. But everything she says should be taken with a grain (or a box) of salt. I believe that she is also a paid lobbiest for (or employee of) IMBA, a mountain biking organization.

Second, what she says is absolute nonsense. Hikers have no problem getting along, or sharing, with mountain bikers. Mountain bikers are just humans, like everyone else. Patty says that hikers "want to keep it all to themselves." That is nonsense. The trails are open to EVERYONE -- always have been, always will be.

But we don't want to share trails with BIKES. If we wanted to be around bikes and other large, fast-moving pieces of MACHINERY, we would stay in the city! There is absolutely no good reason to allow BIKES, which aren't human, and have no rights, in natural areas. They

threaten the safety of wildlife, hikers, horses, and even bikers. But even their mere presence in natural areas destroys the feeling of naturalness that we seek and can ONLY find in natural areas. For the same reason, motor vehicles, radios, and telephones don't belong there. Please don't fall for the mountain bikers' propaganda.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Vandeman, Ph.D.
510-204-0643

From: "Patty Ciesla" <patty.ciesla@norcamba.org>
To: <NorCAMBA@googlegroups.com>
Subject: [NorCAMBA] GGNRA meeting
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 15:21:57 -0700
List-Unsubscribe: <http://googlegroups.com/group/NorCAMBA/subscribe>,
<mailto:NorCAMBA-unsubscribe@googlegroups.com>

A quick note to let you all know I attended the meeting for the GGNRA General Management Plan in San Mateo last night. I arrived towards the end of the drop in session, and got to see the notes from previous visitors. Most are what you'd expect, appreciative of the natural beauty of the parks, desire to protect them, desire for recreational access. The equestrians were busy with comments like "keep bikes off trails."

Josh Moore of ROMP had been there earlier in the day. Steve Griswold and another planner there asked me to clarify what he meant by a "stacked trail" system. Josh was referring to the trail layout guidelines in the IMBA trail solutions manual. I explained a bit about the idea of dispersing bikes in the back country while catering to hikers near the trail heads.

I talked also about revising the trails design guidelines to allow for a wider range of trail construction techniques. Steve mentioned the lawsuit in Marin meant his hands were tied to a 60" width trail. I said that shouldn't apply in San Mateo County and he should be free to do what he feels is best.

He asked me what I thought they ought to do about user conflicts and I said "You need to be like the mom, who tells kids they just have to learn how to get along together, to not fight, to be considerate of each other, and to share. There's no reason we can't get along when that's what expected of us. When people think they don't have to share they will want to keep it all to themselves."

He is also very interested in getting comments on the web form, by email, or by letter. During this scoping phase, many comments from the biking community will help us tremendously as they move forward. Comments are due by May 31. I will send in a letter from NorCAMBA and would appreciate any ideas you guys would like to share.

You can visit the GMP webpage from here:

http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?projectId=15075&documentID=14691

Patty

Patty Ciesla
Executive Director
Northern California Mountain Bicycling Association
PO Box 785
Los Altos, CA 94023-0785
650-917-1741

Mr. James Khoury
960 Oak St.
S.F. CA
94117
(415) 690-0645

Too many Dogs @ Fort Funston!

I'm taking this time to express what I feel is a real problem at Fort Funston...

These Dogs whos numbers seem to grow everyday have effectively hijacked the Park and have created a 'hostile, smelly, dirty' animal of confrontation of a place that was formerly a source of relaxation and peaceful meditation.

Man, it is just a fact! They've really ruined the place...

There's nothing wrong with Dogs but there are just too many... It really must be some kind of Health issue!?

But the owners dont seem to care about anyone else who doesn't themselves own a dog. (I ~~am~~ have a cat)

And there is constant yelling above all this barking this kinda, "voice command"...

I dont want to hear anyone scream ~~at~~ their ~~doggy~~ pooch at the top of their lungs ~~when~~ when I thought it was at the Park to escape (even just for a brief moment in time) from the clamour and Chaos of the City and all its egos, self-righteous, loud mouthed and overbearing ~~denizens~~ denizens the 'latest, this' or the greatest, that' only

It seems they are now here in the Park and have turned it into some Dog-show for the class of San Franciscan...

Well I was born here in S.F. and I cant figure out where these crazy people and their poor pooches are from... But I know that they dont belong in the Park and certainly not with some kind of Domestic animal its pretty strange... But they dont have a clue where they are, I think... Its a place to relax, hear the Wind smell the Ocean not the crime or the Poop!

I dont care to know what breed of Dog it is that they have I want to know perhaps what ~~sea-mammal~~ sea-mammal is going to show itself to me if I'm patient enough. (Which is often on this beach and Coast!)

Or what migratory bird is over head or nest under foot (oops) These Dog-People seem to think that the coast is not a natural setting w/ special need concerns and things to watch out for and be sensitive too.

Its so if it were one big toilet for them, or an extension of themselves to come and relieve themselves in or on.. Its really disgusting! The Park land is more than a

mere backdrop for these disrespectful people to come and play out their own Personal Dramas!

The lack of security some and insensitivity some of these people display can be seen in the manner that they tore down all the Park Posted signs a year or two back. All along the fences these little signs of new park Policy were torn down by some angry Dog-Persons who feel already that they now own the Park... This is upsetting to me because one cannot go there for peace and quiet if all around are people who just dont get it, it seems, or dont care..

There is nothing to be done except to hang ones head and quietly loose one small piece of sanctuary, which is really what the Park area is about after all. Its a sanctuary for all the quiet and small and invisible and unseen and unheard and unknown and that is the only reason worth going out into nature is to sometimes be reminded of it..

And who will speak for these small Snowy Plover birds and for peace and quiet, and the simple wind from far away somewhere blown in across the Ocean..

Not these Dog People. They rally for (4)
their Domestic Pets that should never be out on the Coast
anyway but who speaks for the majority of people
-ples who've been driven out, run off from all their
cloash and noise and fuss and Pomp...

People have simply stop going to Fort Funston.
-I no longer go. I can't stand it, it makes me annoyed...
and I would go there if some sanity were returned.
But that seems difficult with a group of vandals that
is highly organized, more than slightly irrational or illogical
and highly above all else highly self-centered...

They don't seem to care at all about Nature on the Coast
have they even realized that it is there? or that it exists?

Responsible stewardship of the Natural heritage We have been
blessed with seems lost a concept to some of these people...
Responsibility equal to the blessing is lost on some...
and the sad thing is for the rest of us with no where
to turn or address the problem simply pick-up and leave the Park
and the ~~Beach~~ Coast and the Beach... That's not right or fair...

People Domestic Pets have no place in Natural settings...
and some of these people it seems have no idea themselves of how
to behave in a natural setting that must be shared by other
people and by small unseen animals that must call the place home...

I would like to explain why I think that the GGNRA trail building and trail use policy is outdated. illogical. non-sustainable and dangerous. and why these policies should be completely rewritten as part of the GGNRA's new General Management Plan.

WHY GGNRA TRAIL POLICY IS OUTDATED

The GGNRA trail policy is based on the 1983 book titled. "NPS Trails Management Handbook".

A 2003 Point Reyes trail inventory references it and says: "The most recent NPS document providing guidance for trail construction and maintenance is the NPS Trails Management Handbook, published in 1983 by the Denver Service Center."
see:
http://www.nps.gov/pore/pdf/home_mngmntdocs/trailinventory2003_appendixab.pdf

When the NPS Trails Management Handbook was written, mountain biking was in its infancy, and definitely not on any agency's radar. To attempt to apply this handbook to mountain bike use is irresponsible. Modern trail planning policy in the GGNRA (but certainly not all NPS units, as many trail managers have adopted more modern practices) is being made based on a book which is 23 years old! The policies outlined in this 1/4 century old book are contrary to what is being practiced in modern sustainable trail designs which are in use in other federal, state and local jurisdictions. (see below)

WHY GGNRA TRAIL POLICY IS ILLOGICAL

The same Point Reyes document when outlining its trail policy. makes numerous biased claims. For example. in describing equestrian/hiking trails it says:

"These trails provide a leisurely horseback riding or hiking experience. They are unpaved and the developed width may vary from three to six feet. Gradients are similar to those for hiking-only trails. These trails are not appropriate for bicycle use because of potential safety problems and diminished quality of experience."

Why is a narrow-width trail appropriate for hikers and horses but not for bicyclists? The reasons for closing these trails only to bicycles are illogical.

Except for stairways. a modern bicycle allows its rider to traverse the same terrain as a hiker. On my mountain bike I am able to travel the trail with the same dexterity and control as a pedestrian, assuming that I don't ride at an excessive speed. The bike is simply an extension of my feet and can be operated in complete safety. It is not logical to exclude mountain bikes due to vague and unproven "safety problems".

There is no logical reason why a narrow width trail cannot be shared by all user groups. "Diminished quality of experience" is a subjective feeling. one that could apply to all user

groups. Simply sharing a trail does not diminish the quality of experience. Mountain biking is a safe, non-polluting, muscle-powered recreational activity, just like hiking and horseback riding.

The Cactus Forest Trail in Saguaro National Park is a narrow 24 inch wide trail that has been open to hikers, equestrians and mountain bikers for more than 12 years. This popular trail has been safe and without conflict. Thousands of miles of singletrack trails are open to hikers, mountain bikers and equestrians on federal, state and local lands throughout the country. There is clear and compelling evidence that the Point Reyes policy statement quoted above is not only inaccurate and illogical, but also demonstrates a bias against mountain bicycling that is not based on research or fact. It contains opinion and is inappropriate in a planning document.

WHY GGNRA TRAIL POLICY IS NON-SUSTAINABLE

I have hiked and ridden my bicycle on most of the trails within the GGNRA. The fire roads in the parks are generally built along ridge lines and down fall lines. The "fall line" is the direction that gravity would carry water down a hillside. This leads to erosion, and if not addressed, turns a trail or road into a gully that is impassable. Modern trail building techniques state that sustainable multi-use trails should:

--be narrower in width and built along a hill's contours to prevent water from channeling along a fall line.

--utilize grade reversals, rolling grade dips, outsloping and maximum grades (dependent on cross-slope grade and soil types) to prevent water from traveling down a trail.

--should not contain stairways, which are not passable for equestrians and mountain bikers.

In addition, conflicts between bicyclists and other users can be mitigated by using:

--Open sight lines along trails to prevent surprise encounters on blind corners.

--Calming devices, such as tight turns to keep bicycles from building up speed.

--Education, including signage, so that trail users are aware of the need to be respectful of one another.

Many trails in the GGNRA that are badly deteriorating because of poor trail design. The GGNRA planners could benefit from three books that outline the details of modern sustainable trail building techniques and discuss impacts:

1) Trail Solutions: IMBA's Guide to Building Sweet Singletrack
http: www.imba.com/resources/trail_building/trail_solutions.html

2) Natural Surface Trails by Design: Physical and Human Design Essentials of Sustainable, Enjoyable Trails
http://www.imba.com/resources/trail_building/nstbd.html

3) Don Weir's "A Guide to the Impacts of Non-Motorized Trail Use," a comprehensive review of impacts on natural resources as well as social and economic impacts.

It would also benefit the GGNRA planning staff to familiarize themselves with the Bureau of Land Management's "National Mountain Biking Strategic Action Plan." This document, adopted in 2002, is a well-recognized document that provides guidance for accommodating mountain biking on shared use trails.

Lastly, it should be recognized that:

--All user groups contribute to the erosion of natural-surface trails.
--All user groups put some pressure on existing native plant populations by trampling plants near the trail edge and by unintentionally introducing non-native invasive plant species.

Therefore a sustainable trails policy should also include a well-organized volunteer program made up of trail users, which works to both restore native plant populations and eradicate non-native invasive plant species in the natural areas which border the trail system. The NPS' own successful Presidio Park Stewards Volunteer Program, in which I have volunteered regularly for 3 years, and the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy's "Trails Forever" volunteer program satisfy this requirement.

The lack of knowledge about modern trail building science, techniques and user impacts at the GGNRA is unacceptable and GGNRA management is not achieving professional standards in this regard. Operating on a policy that is outdated and illogical as well as supportive of non-sustainable trail designs is unfair to all user groups.

WHY GGNRA TRAIL POLICY IS DANGEROUS

According to the 2004 NPS Presidio Trails and Bikeways Plan, "multi-use trail corridors range from 8 ft to 14 ft wide. The trail corridor would have a hard surface, 6 ft to 10 ft wide, 1 to 2 ft wide soft-surface pedestrian shoulders on one or both sides."
The relevant portion of this plan can be found here:
http://www.nps.gov/goga/admin/planning/trails_bikeways.pdf/final/3_classifications.pdf

These multi-use 6+ foot wide trails are built with hard pack, road-like surfaces that are often covered with rocks and gravel, and which are usually built on relatively steep fall-line grades. Smooth, wide, and steep multi-use trails is the perfect trail design if you are trying to maximize biking speeds. Bicycles can quickly build up a high velocity on these

types of trails and the loose rock and gravel make braking and turning treacherous. In addition, these trails channel water and erode badly, creating additional hazards for all trail users.

In reality, AND TOTALLY CONTRARY TO GGNRA POLICY, narrow-width multi-use trails which are made on natural surfaces, with terrain features such as rocks and curves, with good sight lines and calming devices, and which are built along hill contour lines instead of fall-lines would provide the safety the GGNRA claims to seek. This is because bicycle speed is greatly diminished due to lower trail grades and technical challenges that force bikers to slow down, and are sustainable because the water does not channel down the trail and cause erosion.

The current GGNRA policy of smooth, steep and wide multi-use trails is a recipe for accidents, and a nightmare for risk management staff.

WHAT I AM ASKING GGRNA TO DO

Due to the reasons outlined above, I am asking for a total overhaul of the GGNRA trail building and trail use guidelines as part of the updated General Management Plan. These should include:

1) Trail use and design decisions based on current standards accepted by most federal, state and local agencies.

2) Narrow width, sustainable and challenging trails that are open to all nonmotorized users.

3) Policies based on accepted trail building science and peer-reviewed research instead of personal bias.

thank you,

Aaron D Thies
221 17th Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94121
athies@yahoo.com
415-317-3753

06/05/2006 04:14 AM EDT

tsai@mailcity.com, yep@unex.berkeley.edu

cc:

Subject: The Statue of Community & Ring of Peaceful Understanding: a Proposed New National Monument for Alcatraz Island by Peter B. DuMont; STAR ALLIANCE Foundation

STAR ALLIANCE
• FOUNDATION •
– Peace Education & Inspiration for All –
A Nonprofit, Nonsectarian Initiative Since 1985
P.O. Box 11125
Berkeley, California 94712
510-848-1818
Peter B. DuMont, Co-Founder & President
PeterDuMont@STARALLIANCE.org

2006 June 5 (early!)

Ms. Lee Ann Ciancetti
National Park Service
San Francisco, CA.

Dear Lee Ann:

Thanks so much for all your assistance and encouragement over the last week! "I couldn't have done it without you!"

As promised and qualified by voicemail Sunday evening, here is an advance proof copy of our proposal. Please be kind, assuming time allows, to review or scan it, to give me some initial feedback (off the record is OK); and to advise me whether you are OK to be listed as a point of contact for the NPS, (It can just be noted as a cc if preferred) and if not or in addition: is there anyone else I should note at this point? Also any contacts you would advise on the same basis at the City & County of San Francisco and other agencies.

Gratefully yours in commitment to all our "Highest Common Ideals,"

Peter DuMont

cc:
Ernest Siravo, Co-Founder
Yvonne Prevo
Jerry Tsai
Members, STAR ALLIANCE Board of Trustees

[Unable to display image]

"To Form A More Perfect Union"

"Communicate, Cooperate & Celebrate" for

THE STATUE OF COMMUNITY

A New National Monument
on Alcatraz Island,

to be Integrated with Existing Structures
and supported on

THE RING OF PEACEFUL UNDERSTANDING

A Vision for Concrete Citizens' Participation & Commitment
to "Universal Peace Ethics" – "Our Highest Common Ideals"

Concept by Peter B. DuMont
Co-Founder
STAR ALLIANCE FOUNDATION
"Peace Education & Inspiration for All"
A Nonprofit Initiative Since 1985

2006

The Historical Context

The Statue of Liberty in New York harbor has long stood for American values, particularly freedom and independence. The STAR ALLIANCE Foundation proposes a complementary monument of equal impact on San Francisco Bay: "The Statue of Community." This new monument will be integrated with existing structures and promote national and global citizens' unity in commitment to the community values which can sustain freedom in the United States and throughout the Earth – humanity's "Highest Common Ideals."*

In the sweeping course of geologic history, Mother Nature has kindly provided a dramatic rock pedestal near San Francisco's Golden Gate. "Alcatraz Island" is viewed by thousands daily from "Fisherman's Wharf," "Pacific Heights" and other prime view points, and serves as a magnetic attraction to millions from across the United States and around the world.

In the last few "milliseconds" of geologic time, the United States has used Alcatraz to support two great institutions of conflict: a Civil War fort, and a prison. The vacant prison remains a relic of intense historical fascination and an economic engine for tourism.

But do we as a society want to maintain an unmitigated prison theme on this magnificent natural pedestal forever? If we are honest, we will admit that the prison by itself, while interesting to many, is also a depressing mega-monument to social isolation and failure. Famously, the American Indian Movement has also laid claim to the island as both a sacred site and symbolic holding.

The Invitation

Without detracting from the island's economic, environmental, social and historical assets; we can add to them, just as the Golden Gate Bridge has added to the beauty and function of its natural and built settings. The STAR ALLIANCE foundation invites the National Park Service, the American Indian and other ethnic communities, architects, artists, leaders and the public to come together in the spirit of public service and help create a counterbalancing, spiritually refreshing and universally appealing public statement on "The Rock!"

Envision with us a spectacular new sight and experience which adds function, aesthetics, public appeal and major symbolic value to the island while

keeping further disruption of natural habitat to a minimum.

"The Ring of Peaceful Understanding"

Utilizing mainly just airspace once constructed, and drawing on the Native American and otherwise ubiquitous symbol of the hoop or ring, the "Ring of Peaceful Understanding" is situated horizontally above the main prison block at the top of the island. It is supported by four to six massive, graceful "flying arches" coming up from The Rock around the prison. From a distance the Ring thus appears somewhat like a halo or futuristic space station. It pleasingly exceeds the walls of the prison on at least two sides. Public access is enhanced via improvements to some pathways and to the landing dock; but stairways, escalators and elevators or "slidecars" into The Ring itself are integrated into the archways, minimizing major new ground "footprints" to essentially only the foundations of the stanchions and necessary access paths.

"The Statue of Community."

Atop the great Ring of Peaceful Understanding towers a circle of heroic human figures, sheathed in bronze or other durable and aesthetic media. They represent the diverse family of humanity: young and old, male and female; different ethnic and cultural groups from around the world. Native American and other indigenous peoples appear prominently in ceremonial regalia. The circle of figures surrounds a smaller spherical or domed representation of Planet Earth, our common home. The figures' arms are raised high above heads; hands forever inter-clasped in a joyful gesture of cooperation and solidarity, friendship, mutual strength and celebration in honor of common ideals.

The Tower of Starlight

Rising from the "planetary" center and towering above all is a steel and glass "fountain of light," culminating in a splay of stars to which the figures' gazes are uplifted and fixed. The stars represent humanity's "Highest Common Ideals" — values not of one group or faction but those with which everyone can choose to connect and integrate peacefully and sustainably — within themselves, their families, communities and the entire diverse human race. Represented are the ideals of universal mutual respect and goodwill, honesty and integrity, fairness and responsibility; friendship; "Communication, Cooperation and Celebration" for common goals — with an unswerving commitment to resolve common conflicts toward mutual and universal benefit.

Public access is allowed on top of the ring, which is fitted with a protective, decorative railing and alarm system to minimize danger. Handsome plaques tell about the origin, meaning and special details of each of the figures and other monument features, explain views of the environs, and describe scientific facts illuminating the geologic and cosmic contexts in which Earth and humanity exist. Individual, hand-painted peace tiles from every state of the Union and every member country of the United Nations are incorporated into the rim wall, deck and statuary bases.

Overall Symbolism

Observing The Ring from the outside, the symbolism is clear: "peaceful under-standing" is that shared knowledge and culture of peace which we create under and supportive to where we stand for peace and united progress. Unified by a common commitment to ethical community, communicating and cooperating with integrity, human beings achieve peaceful coexistence and rise successfully above persistent conflicts. But breaking away from universal ethical laws, the world of isolation and suffering readily awaits below. The dramatically opposing elements of the combined monument heighten each other's impact in a bold and vividly realistic way, providing a timeless source of public education and inspiration for the ethical ways of lasting peace. Native American and Indigenous People's cultural wisdom and participation to educate and uplift public harmony are incorporated and honored throughout the monument and in the process of creating it.

The Inner Deck of the Ring

The inner deck of The Ring is sheltered from the elements by an overhanging roof and alternately glassed-in and open sides. All the way around spectacular views are afforded of San Francisco and the Golden Gate; Marin County and Angel Island, Yerba Buena and Treasure Islands; the East Bay and the Bay Bridge.

On the inner circular wall of The Ring, surrounding the structural and service core (or empty space decorated with individual peace tiles, etc.) are backlit displays of cultural and historical fascination. Some are permanent and some are periodically refreshed (depending on design details. See more below.).

An inner hallway, with walls of glass, allows access to the continuous display wall and a transparent "see-through" effect to and from the midrange spaces. An outer, glass-enclosed hallway allows for unobstructed views outbound all around The Ring, as well as for natural light inflow. Skylights in the interior ceilings further enhance natural lighting and allow unique public perspectives on the towering figures and "fountain of stars" above. There is a sense of pleasant transparency throughout the monument, contrasting with the opaque prison below. In between the two glass-walled hallways are periodic restaurant and lounge spaces, a theater, a small planetarium, museum and meeting spaces and periodic open passageways. (A theater, planetarium and/or a unique observation space may be created below and inside the globe or partial Earth-dome structure depending on final size, design, engineering and cost considerations. In this context, it is not impossible, though perhaps unlikely, to have some rotation features incorporated into The Ring itself. The globe portion, however, could certainly rotate to good effect at reasonable cost.)

The Citizens' Participation Television & Web Studios

A "STAR ALLIANCE" Foundation, Citizens' Television, Radio and Web-casting feature is incorporated into the monument, allowing visitors to record and broadcast their reactions to the monument and comment on subjects bearing on world peace and understanding. Broadcast is direct over the web, and participation is solicited from KQED and PBS; NPR and PRI, etc.. The tone of public participation is generally guided and inspired by the purpose and quality of the monument, and by the STAR ALLIANCE "Citizen's Pledge of Nonviolence and Good Will," and "Citizens' Declaration of Highest Common Ideals." (See below, and at www.STARALLIANCE.org.)

More on the Displays

On the inner Ring wall are impressive treatments of the United Nations Charter Preamble and excerpts of the text (signed in San Francisco in 1945); The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Covenants on Economic and Social Rights; The International Convention on the Rights of the Child; etc.. Importantly highlighting citizen participation, historic early editions for children and adults of the STAR ALLIANCE Citizens' Declaration(s) for Peace and "Our Highest Common Ideals will be displayed, bearing the signatures of noted celebrity achievers and everyday citizens alike. In adjoining rooms, visitors may sign update editions of "The Declaration of Ideals" and "Citizens' Pledge for Nonviolence and Good Will;" and make individual, hand-painted peace tiles to be displayed publicly in some cases, or taken home. These activities provide a model for citizen participation in other parts of the nation and the world.

Periodic displays and multimedia showings can educate visitors (space and design-process allowing) on subjects of more general history and social, religious and cultural anthropology; delighting them with art, technology and multicultural fascination.

The Specialty Restaurant(s).

Incorporating popular recommendations, highly regarded ethnic chefs are periodically invited to cook and be recorded for public television programming at The Ring using one or more prime restaurant spaces built in. These "chefs of renown" donate their services for short periods in return for the special recognition, privilege and pleasure of serving at The Ring. Funds saved from the master chef's donated appearances go to the People's Lasting Peace Education and Friendship Fund. This fund benefits STAR ALLIANCE programs and a coalition of member charities working for world peace and understanding. A substantial portion of profits from the restaurant operations as a whole goes to the help pay for the monument and what will surely be some increased operating costs.

Summary of Regional, National and Global Benefits

Given its purpose, the project is sure to draw support from a broad spectrum of society including the ecumenical / cross-cultural faith sectors. Without unduly favoring any faction, it will celebrate the rich weave of ethnic, religious and cultural communities which is now America, as more and more She partners, reflects and integrates the world into a peaceful and sustainable

whole. Peaceful and sustainable if, that is, people choose broadly and wisely for the ethics which support the processes of peace. This "if" encompasses both the glory and danger of human freedom. It is why it is so important to support effectively: genuinely universal ethics, using public institutions, resources, alliances and prominent public places.

The experience of visiting Alcatraz and viewing it from a distance will be beautifully and dramatically enhanced by The Ring of Understanding and The Statue of Community. The positive impact will extend to the entire Bay Area and its tourist-dependent economies, and far beyond via the Citizens' Media broadcasts and word of mouth. This new national monument will attract global publicity, uplift public spirit everywhere and provide a focal point for many ongoing, positive public impacts. It will be a truly universal symbol, a teaching tool and inspiration for peace and friendship for those now living and all future generations. The stellar reputation of San Francisco as birthplace of the United Nations and a now "universe-class" City of Peace will be continuously enhanced. The reputation of the United States of America as a leader in human rights, benevolent leadership and progress toward peace will be significantly improved. Everyone will "win."

[Please Note: The Ring could also conceivably be placed over the parade ground with numerous advantages for ease and reduced costs for construction. However this would result in a sharp decline in symbolism as well as badly degrading the envisioned views from both observation decks, and the views observing the island and monument from afar.]

Initial Contact Points (2006):

STAR ALLIANCE –
Peace Education Foundation:
Peter B. DuMont
Co-Founder and President
P.O. Box 11125
Berkeley, California 94712
Tel: 510-848-1818
Fax: 510-649-8425
E-Mail: PeterDuMont@STARALLIANCE.org
(Note: Telephone or fax are preferred for most timely guaranteed responses at present.)
* www.STARALLIANCE.org

National Park Service:

_____

City of San Francisco:

_____

American Indian Movement:

_____

* * * * *

Initial notes on possible next steps, etc..

As practical steps toward realizing this vision in our lifetimes, may I suggest and request that appropriate officials please:

• Realize this is a long-range vision. Take the vision into consideration as current plans for Alcatraz are pursued.

• Please schedule telephone or in-person, get-acquainted meetings as soon as mutually convenient so appropriate stakeholder concerns and initial solution ideas can be seeded efficiently.

• Paying for the Monument. Its global nature will lend itself to global sponsorship. Contributions may be solicited from multinational corporations and foundations, foreign governments and individuals throughout the world. The STAR ALLIANCE Foundation plans a global campaign to create a "People's Lasting Peace Education and Friendship Fund." Our goal is $1 per person on the planet, using earnings only for our peace education projects. This public campaign and a related campaign for the monument, giving recognition at the monument and on the web, could potentially all work well together.

• Plans can be developed for an inspiring nationwide and global design and engineering contest, as well as for cooperative funding strategies. The contest, sponsored and promoted incorporating diverse members of the business and nonprofit communities – will enable public participation to build on and refine the basic themes outlined here and take into account critiques, enthusiasm, suggestions and resources from many different places.

• A reminder: Tax-deductible donations and volunteer assistance are gladly accepted by our 501(c)3 peace initiative, which is celebrating its 20th Anniversary year.

• Please direct any questions and concerns, comments and suggestions promptly to me at the numbers and addresses shown.

Distinguished officials and advisors, although this vision will take years to fully design, approve, fund and construct; let us begin now: for our own sake as well as future generations'. Let us express our combined intelligence creatively and "integratively," setting a concrete example of good social process leading to outstanding final results. Let us choose happily, practically and most wisely to invest attention and resources together and create on this truly magnificent pedestal at our beautiful Golden Gate a higher symbolic, educational, artistic and recreational future for ourselves, the proverbial "seven generations," and beyond. The returns in indirect savings to the taxpayers alone will, I predict, be stupendous, and far "out-justify" the cost!

Yours in lasting commitment to our "Highest Common Ideals,"

Peter Bruce DuMont
Co-Founder; Education Director
STAR ALLIANCE

* * * * *

MISCELLANEOUS (OPTIONAL READ) / ADDENDUM / COMPOSITION NOTES:

Remember the obstacles that Joseph Strauss had to overcome to get the Golden Gate Bridge constructed? Where would we be practically and aesthetically
today without his initiative and determination, and without the community's ultimate cooperation? Compared to that project, this one will be much easier for all of us – and a most wholesome and enjoyable project at that! – far less strenuous than the 1915 Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco's Marina; or the 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition and World's Fair
at Treasure Island; or ongoing conversion of the Presidio. Too, the STAR ALLIANCE foundation's proposal for Alcatraz holds the potential to inspire the entire planet in an ongoing way.

This will be a monument of millennial meanings and proportion. Conflict will always be with us, and seriously breaking the law has serious consequences. But handled skillfully, efficiently, and early; conflict can be kept at a low level; its severest symptoms rendered obsolete. The ongoing, peaceful work of resolving and transforming conflict into positive growth serves
to generate lasting understanding and solutions which uplift each individual and the entire, diverse community – races, religions, nations and other factions, worldwide – toward that great American ideal: "a more perfect union."

PeterDuMont@STARALLIANCE.net
Tel: 510-540-8887 / (preferred telephone line & fax when present: 848-1818.)
24-hour fax: c/o 510-649-8425.

Street Address:
2322 Shattuck Avenue #416
Berkeley, CA. 94704
P.O. BOX 11125, Berkeley, CA. 94712

www.STARALLIANCE.org

(Following was at very beginning, 2001 edition):

As you review these reflections on a proposed new national [global] monument for peace [and friendship] on Alcatraz, please consider the themes of Intelligence and Integration. Intelligence: from Latin roots meaning "to gather"
and "choose between;" Integration: "to bring together into a whole, lacking nothing." I am proposing the "choosing" and "bringing together" of resources to
accomplish a great goal.

Note: Run this by some key Native American Leaders ASAP!

* * * * *