



National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior

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

## Golden Gate National Recreation Area News Release

For Immediate Release

Sent on September 5, 2013

Contact: Howard Levitt Phone: 415-561-4730 Mobile: 415-725-8589  
Alexandra Picavet Mobile: 415-786-8021 alexandra\_picavet@nps.gov

### **Golden Gate National Recreation Area Releases Second Draft of Dog Management Plan *Supplemental EIS now available for public comment, public open house meeting dates set.***

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area, CA**— On Friday, September 6, 2013, the National Park Service (NPS) released a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Draft Dog Management Plan (draft plan/SEIS) for Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The draft plan/SEIS will be open for public comment for 90 days, concluding on December 4, 2013.

The overall purpose of dog management planning at Golden Gate is to determine the manner and extent of dog walking in appropriate areas of the park, provide a clear, enforceable dog management policy, provide a variety of visitor experiences, improve visitor and employee safety, reduce user conflicts and preserve and protect natural and cultural resources and natural processes.

The draft plan/SEIS follows a previous draft plan/EIS, released in January 2011 that generated 4700 comment letters. The draft plan/SEIS responds to the substantive comments on the draft plan/EIS and includes analysis of dog management for the newest area of the park, Rancho Corral de Tierra. Because of the amount of new information and analysis, the entire document has been reissued.

The draft plan/SEIS incorporates new data, considers additional research, makes some changes to the impacts analysis, changes the management strategy to accentuate monitoring and eliminate automatic triggers; evaluates fencing as a tool to manage dog impacts and makes changes to the preferred alternative at several sites, and includes site specific alternatives and analysis for Rancho Corral de Tierra in San Mateo County. This new site in Golden Gate National Recreation Area was added to the park in December 2011, after the development and release of the draft Plan/EIS.

The draft plan/SEIS evaluates the impacts of six alternatives for dog management in 22 areas of Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The preferred alternative includes:

- Site-specific treatments that allow for a balanced range of visitor experiences, with areas that allow on-leash and off-leash/voice-control dog walking, as well as areas that prohibit dogs
- Off-leash/voice control dog walking in seven specific areas of the park where impacts to visitor experience and safety and sensitive resources would be minimized
- On-leash dog walking in many areas of the park
- No dog walking in areas of the park where impacts were unacceptable and could not be mitigated
- A monitoring-based management strategy that would measure compliance with the dog walking regulation and impacts to resources. The resulting data would inform park management and law enforcement when, where, and how to prioritize responses to noncompliance
- Permits allowing both individual and commercial dog walkers to walk more than three dogs, with a limit of six dogs, in seven areas of the park
- Site-specific analysis of dog walking alternatives in Rancho Corral de Tierra, the newest park site in San Mateo County.

EXPERIENCE YOUR AMERICA™

The National Park Service cares for special places saved by the American people so that all may experience our heritage.

### **Public Comments Welcomed**

The NPS will accept comments on the draft plan/SEIS for 90 days, until December 4, 2013. All comments are welcome, but the NPS is most interested in comments on the changes between the draft plan/EIS and draft plan/SEIS. Comments submitted on the 2011 draft plan/EIS will continue to be considered and do not need to be resubmitted.

Copies of the draft plan/SEIS will be available for public review and comment at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan>. A limited number of hard copies and compact discs will be available on request. Copies of the draft plan/SEIS will also be available at local libraries in San Mateo, San Francisco and Marin Counties, as well as in Berkeley and Oakland. A full list of libraries is at [www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm](http://www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm)

### **Dates and Locations for Three Public Open House Meetings:**

Saturday, November 2, 2013, 11:00 AM-4:00 PM

Fort Mason Center, Bldg. D, Fleet Room  
2 Marina Blvd  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Monday, November 4, 2013, 4:30-8:30 PM

Farallone View Elementary School  
1100 LeConte Avenue  
Montara, CA 94037

Wednesday, November 6, 2013, 4:00-8:00 PM

Tamalpais High School, Ruby Scott Gym  
700 Miller Avenue  
Mill Valley, CA 94941

**Rulemaking Process:** The draft plan/SEIS is one step in developing a final rule on dog walking in Golden Gate National Recreation Area. After comments on the draft plan/SEIS have been received, evaluated, and addressed, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking will be published and circulated for public comment. A final rule will be published after the final plan/EIS has been published and a Record of Decision signed, in late 2015.

### **Additional Information on Commenting**

NPS encourages commenting online through the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan>. Note that the deadline for submitting comments online in PEPC is **midnight, Mountain Time (11pm Pacific Time)** on December 4, 2013.

Comments will also be accepted during the three open house public meetings. Written comments may be sent by U.S. Postal Service or other mail delivery service or hand-delivered to: Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Fort Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, CA 94123, Attn: Dog Management SEIS.

Comments will not be accepted by fax, e-mail, or in any other way than those specified above. Bulk comments in any format (hard copy or electronic) submitted on behalf of others will not be accepted. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

- ### -

## FACT SHEET

---

**Park Name** GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, MUIR WOODS NM, FORT POINT NHS

---

**Purpose** The purpose of Golden Gate National Recreation Area is to offer national park experience to a large and diverse urban population while preserving and interpreting its outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values.

---

**Resources** \*

- 1,200 historic structures: 5 National Historic Landmarks Districts, 13 National Register of Historic Places properties, 365 identified and over 500 predicted archeological sites, 9 cultural landscapes, 5 lighthouses
- \* Home to 1,287 plant and animal species, that encompasses 91 miles of bay and ocean shoreline.
- \* Part of the UNESCO Golden Gate Biosphere Reserve
- \* Comprised of 19 separate ecosystems in 7 distinct watersheds
- \* Home to the largest museum collection in the National Park System
- \* Contains the 4<sup>th</sup> largest number of federally protected or endangered species of all 401 units within the National Park Service.

---

**Park Background** Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) includes under its management two additional National Park Areas--Fort Point National Historic Site, and Muir Woods National Monument. It is administered by the National Park Service under the Department of the Interior. One of the most visited units of the National Park system, GGNRA has over 17 million visitors a year and is one of the largest urban parks in the world. GGNRA is not one continuous locale, but rather a collection of areas in three counties (San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo). The park is as diverse as it is expansive; containing attractions such as Alcatraz Island, the Marin Headlands and Rancho Corral de Tierra. GGNRA also holds significant historical and natural resources and houses the largest museum collection in the National Park Service. GGNRA has 4% of the total number of historic structures in the whole National Park System. Over half of North American avian species and nearly one third of California's plant species are found in the park. Of the 36 federally listed threatened and endangered species found within Golden Gate National Recreation Area's legislative boundaries 25 are found within lands managed by the National Park Service.

---

<b>Statistics:</b> (including Fort, Point NHS, Muir Woods MN, and the Presidio).	<b>Acreage:</b>	Gross Area Acres Legislated: 80,624 (of which 20,000/ managed by NPS)
	<b>Visitation:</b>	Total Recreation Visits for Fiscal Year 2012: Total 17,015,455; the sum of Golden Gate NRA 14,540,338; Fort Point NHS 1,502,786; and Muir Woods NM 972,331
	<b>NPS Staffing:</b>	262 employees (194 Permanent; 42 Term; 26 Temporary) excluding USPP
	<b>Budget:</b>	President's Requested budget for Fiscal Year 2012: \$27,046,000

---

**Park Partners** Golden Gate National Recreation Area partners with more than 25 nonprofit and commercial organizations as well as other government agencies that provide a wide range of visitor services and activities within the park, including the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, its cooperating association.

---

<b>Congressional Districts</b>	U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein	U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer
	U.S. Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, 8 <sup>th</sup>	Congressional District
	U.S. Congresswoman Jackie Speier, 12 <sup>th</sup>	Congressional District
	U.S. Congresswoman Jared Huffman, 2 <sup>th</sup>	Congressional District
	U.S. Congresswoman Anna Eshoo, 14 <sup>th</sup>	Congressional District

---



# Golden Gate National Recreation Area

## DOG MANAGEMENT

### Draft Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

#### Frequently Asked Questions

September 6, 2013

**1. What are the goals of the draft plan/SEIS?**

The current situation with dog management in the park is confusing and has led to controversy and conflicts. The park's overall dog management goal is to develop a new regulation for dog management that is understandable, enforceable, provides a variety of visitor experiences and protects resources.

**2. Where can I view the draft plan/SEIS, and how can I submit comments?**

Go to the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) website at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan> to review and comment online.

Copies of the plan are also available at libraries in San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo Counties, and the East Bay (full list at [www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm](http://www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm)).

The draft plan/SEIS is available for review and comment for 90 days; September 6 until midnight Mountain Time (11 p.m. Pacific Time), December 4, 2013.

Comments may be submitted:

- Online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan>; or
- By mail or other delivery to Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Building 201, Fort Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123, Attn: Dog Management SEIS
- By attending one of the public open-house meetings in early November (listed at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan> and at [www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm](http://www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm))

Comments will not be accepted by fax, email, or in any other way than those specified above. Bulk comments in any format (hard copy or electronic) submitted on behalf of others will not be accepted. Before including a personal address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in a comment, reviewers should be aware that the entire comment—including personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While reviewers can ask us in their comment to withhold their personal identifying information from public review, the NPS cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

For questions about commenting, call the Dog Management Information line (415-561-4728) and leave a message and call-back number. Park staff will respond to your call.

### **3. Why has GGNRA developed a second EIS for dog management?**

The park received 4,713 individual pieces of correspondence, containing 8,000 substantive comments, on the 2011 draft plan/EIS. This draft plan/SEIS responds to those substantive comments and includes analysis of dog management for the newest area of the park, Rancho Corral de Tierra. Because of the amount of new information and analysis, the entire document has been reissued. The draft plan/SEIS includes a Reader's Guide, available with the online version of the document, to help direct reviewers to the substantive changes in the document.

In this public comment phase, we need to hear from a broad range of users as to whether the preferred alternative in the draft plan/SEIS adequately provides a range of visitor experiences while protecting park resources within this unit of the national park system.

### **4. What's in the draft plan/SEIS?**

The plan includes six management alternatives, one of which is the park's preferred alternative, for 22 areas of the park. These 22 areas include all the major areas where dog walking currently occurs and essentially lays out the future for where and how dog walking will occur parkwide.

### **5. What is a Preferred Alternative?**

A preferred alternative is the alternative in an EIS which the NPS believes would best accomplish the purpose and need of the proposed action while fulfilling its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical, and other factors. 43 CFR 46.4.20(d).

The preferred alternative in the draft plan/SEIS includes the following:

- On-leash and/or off-leash, voice-control dog walking in certain, specific areas of the park where impacts on visitor experience and safety and sensitive resources were minimal,
- No dogs in areas of the park where impacts were unacceptable and could not be mitigated,
- The commercial dog walking recommendation from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee,
- A monitoring-management strategy to guide a range of park responses to non-compliance,
- Permits for private or commercial dog walkers who wish to walk more than three dogs, with a limit of 6, in seven specific areas of the park.

### **6. What are the key changes between the 2011 draft plan/EIS and this draft plan/SEIS?**

- Addition of new data
- Consideration of additional research

- Some changes to the impacts analysis
- Changes to the management strategy to accentuate monitoring and eliminate automatic triggers
- Evaluation of fencing as a tool to manage dog impacts
- Changes to the preferred alternative at several sites, and site specific alternatives and analysis for Rancho Corral de Tierra in San Mateo County, which was not part of the park when the draft plan/EIS was developed.

**7. Does the draft plan/SEIS ban dogs from the park?**

No. The dog management planning process dismissed alternatives banning dogs from the park as not meeting the purpose of the planning effort. The range of alternatives in the draft plan/SEIS permits dog walking, both on leash and off-leash under voice control, in many areas of the park. The preferred alternative includes 7 areas, including beaches, where dogs may be walked off-leash under voice control and 22 park sites with areas (beaches, trails and grassy areas) open to on-leash.

**8. Are there any other national park areas that allow off leash dog walking?**

No. The national NPS regulation on dogs states that where dog walking is permitted in parks, dogs must be on leash.

In 2002, a panel of senior NPS officials concluded that because of the special circumstances at Golden Gate, it is appropriate for the park to consider off-leash dog walking in areas that meet certain criteria.

**9. Was there public input in the development of the plan?**

Yes. The plan is informed by the input of thousands of people over a 12-year period. Public involvement took the form of numerous public meetings, written comments, stakeholder presentations and discussions, and a federal negotiated rulemaking process. Most recently, the draft plan/EIS was open for public comment for 5.5 months and the park received over 4700 pieces of correspondence. Additional input came from senior NPS management at the regional and national level, with specialized expertise in resources and park management.

**10. Will the NPS really give consideration to public comment on the draft plan/SEIS?**

Yes. Every substantive comment will be carefully considered in developing a final plan/EIS. Without exception, every draft EIS released by the park since it was established in 1972 was refined and improved as a result of public comment.

**11. The draft plan/SEIS is very long. Do I have to read the entire document?**

No. We have prepared a Reader's Guide to reviewing the plan, available with the online version of the draft plan/SEIS, which will direct you to the sections that have changed

since the draft plan/EIS. There is also a short Executive Summary of the plan, which is the first 28 pages of the document. If you're interested in a particular area, see the index listings for Chapter 2 for descriptions of the alternatives and then go to the listing of alternative maps to see the alternatives for each site(s).

**12. Is the draft plan/SEIS the final dog walking regulation for GGNRA?**

No. The draft plan/SEIS is an assessment of the environmental impacts of a range of management alternatives, including the NPS Preferred Alternative. After review of public comment on the draft plan/SEIS and any resulting changes to the preferred alternative, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking will be published for additional public comment. After consideration of the relevant comments on the proposed rule, and after publication of the final plan/EIS and Record of Decision, the NPS will publish a final rule, which is anticipated in late 2015.



## ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

### 13. Does the draft plan/SEIS address all lands within the boundary of GGNRA?

The draft plan/SEIS addresses dog walking in 22 sites of the approximately 20,000 acres within the GGNRA boundary that are managed by the park. It does not address lands within the park boundary managed by other agencies such as the Presidio Trust, Point Reyes National Seashore or the San Francisco Public Utility Commission.

Other GGNRA managed lands within the park boundary that are not specifically covered in this draft plan/SEIS will continue to be governed by the existing NPS regulation for dog walking, 36 CFR 2.15 which requires dogs to be kept on a leash where they are allowed.

### 14. How were those 22 specific areas chosen for inclusion in the draft plan/SEIS?

Initially, 21 park areas were developed by the NPS as the parameters for discussion of dog management by the GGNRA Negotiated Rulemaking Committee for Dog Management, an initial attempt to develop a new dog walking regulation for the park with direct input from stakeholder groups. The parameters set the limits for discussion, by identifying, up front, areas that would be open to consideration for on-leash dog walking, areas open to consideration for dog walking off-leash, under voice control, and areas that would not be open to consideration for dog walking. Development of the parameters was guided by a panel of senior NPS officials who, in 2002, recommended the following to the park's General Superintendent:

*"The panel concludes that off-leash dog walking in GGNRA may be appropriate in selected locations where resource impacts can be adequately mitigated and public safety incidents and public use conflicts can be appropriately managed. The panel further recommends that the park pursue both rulemaking and comprehensive planning for pet management to address suitable locations and proper management strategies."*

An additional area, Rancho Corral de Tierra, was added in this draft plan/SEIS. That site transferred to the park when the draft plan/EIS had already been completed. The draft plan/SEIS provides the opportunity to specifically address that new property.

### 15. What are the current rules governing dog management at GGNRA?

Currently, dog management at GGNRA varies by area and is a combination of the following:

- NPS federal regulation (36 CFR 2.15) — requires that dogs be on leash wherever dog walking is permitted in an NPS area,
- GGNRA Citizen Advisory Commission's 1979 Pet Policy — recommending off-leash dog walking in certain areas of GGNRA. This aspect of current park

management is the result of the 2005 federal court decision *US v. Barley* (405 F. Supp.2d 1121 (N.D. CA 2005)),

- NPS special regulation for protection of western snowy plovers on Ocean Beach and the WPA at Crissy Field (36 CFR 7.97(d)), and
- GGNRA Compendium (compilation of park-specific rules).

**16. What is the 1979 Pet Policy?**

The GGNRA Citizen's Advisory Commission's 1979 Pet Policy recommended to the park that certain, specific areas of GGNRA be open to off-leash voice control dog walking. Although the park was never able to formalize this policy as a federal regulation, this unofficial pet policy was in place within GGNRA for more than 20 years.

**17. Why doesn't GGNRA simply adopt the 1979 Pet Policy as its dog management regulation?**

Conditions within the park have changed significantly since 1979; increased visitation, addition of park areas and increased knowledge of resources within the park must be taken into consideration in the development of any dog management regulation. An NPS rule must also be consistent with applicable statutory requirements, such as the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act. However, the 1979 Pet Policy was developed without any environmental analysis. In addition, the draft plan/SEIS found that accepting the 1979 Pet Policy in its entirety would not meet the purpose and need of the plan; therefore, formalizing the Pet Policy as the dog management regulation was considered but dismissed.

**18. What are the concerns about current off-leash dog walking in GGNRA?**

Although the 1979 Pet Policy and current park information state that dogs off-leash in the park must be under control, the park has no legally-enforceable voice-control guidelines governing off-leash behavior, and currently many off-leash dogs are not well-controlled by their walkers. Uncontrolled, off-leash dogs create safety issues for park visitors, staff, and other dogs, and are a source of conflict between dog walkers and other user groups.

**19. What is the definition of voice and sight control dog walking that would be required under a new GGNRA dog walking regulation?**

As defined in the draft plan/SEIS, voice and sight control means that dogs must be within direct eyesight of the dog walker, and that dog walkers must be able to immediately recall their dog(s) to their side so that a leash can be attached to the dog(s)'s collar, and shall demonstrate this ability when requested by Law Enforcement personnel. This definition is similar to other land management agencies that allow off-leash dog walking.

**20. Why does the GGNRA draft plan/SEIS treat dog walking differently than other areas of the National Park Service?**

The November 2002 Federal Panel Recommendation to the General Superintendent on Proposed Rulemaking for Pet Management at GGNRA noted that the park has a unique set of characteristics. Those characteristics are: sites which had historically been used for off-leash dog walking; the GGNRA Citizen's Advisory Commission 1979 Pet Policy that recommended the continuation of those uses, and the park's adoption of that policy for over 20 years; and management of a significant portion of the public recreational open space in San Francisco and San Mateo and Marin Counties, where residents rely on portions of that open space for exercise of their pets.

Because of these unique characteristics, the park considered a range of alternatives intended to provide a variety of experiences, including voice control dog walking, while protecting visitor experience and safety and park resources.

**21. GGNRA is a national recreation area. Do national recreation areas have different management policies than national parks?**

No. All units of the national park system are guided by the same NPS Management Policies, regardless of the park's designation as a national park, national recreation area, national historic site, national lakeshore or other (there are 35 types of national park units). Congress amended the 1916 NPS Organic Act in 1970 to make clear that the NPS must manage all units of the national park system to the same preservation standard.

**22. What is "Negotiated Rulemaking," and why did GGNRA use this form of rulemaking from 2006-2007 as a preliminary step in the dog management planning process?**

Negotiated Rulemaking is one way that federal agencies can develop rules. This method requires the formal involvement of key stakeholders, together with the agency. Given the longstanding and passionate interest that various stakeholders have in this issue, and because GGNRA has a deep tradition of community engagement, the park saw value in working in partnership with stakeholders who have diverse values and views to try and develop a rule for dog management through consensus. The Committee was formed with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to develop consensus recommendations for both voice-control and on-leash dog walking, as well as for use and limits of professional dog walking.

**23. What was the outcome of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee for Dog Management and how will recommendations of the Committee be used by the NPS?**

The Committee worked from March 2006 to the end of October 2007 but, after many meetings and working sessions, was unable to reach consensus on a proposed rule for all areas open for discussion. However, there was consensus on overarching guidelines for

dog management and commercial dog walking as well as for a management option for one site – Oakwood Valley. All these areas of consensus have been included in two of the alternatives in the draft plan/SEIS, and two are included in the NPS preferred alternative. Although the Committee was unable to reach consensus on a full rule, the many meetings of the Committee provided much information that aided the NPS in the development of the draft plan/SEIS.

**24. What should people consider when they comment on the draft plan/SEIS?**

The NPS is looking for substantive comments after review of the range of alternatives, including the preferred alternative, and the impacts of those alternatives. Examples of substantive comments include providing additional factual information, noting issues or impacts NPS may have failed to consider, inconsistencies, and other comments of substance, as opposed to comments voicing like or dislike without an underlying rationale.

**25. Once a final rule is issued, how will it be enforced?**

The park will enforce the final rule as it does all other rules. But in addition, the park will depend on the active involvement of user groups to support implementation of the rule by assisting in education and outreach to their members.

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area**  
**DOG MANAGEMENT**  
**Draft Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**

**Frequently Asked Questions**  
**September 6, 2013**

**1. What are the goals of the draft plan/SEIS?**

The current situation with dog management in the park is confusing and has led to controversy and conflicts. The park's overall dog management goal is to develop a new regulation for dog management that is understandable, enforceable, provides a variety of visitor experiences and protects resources.

**2. Where can I view the draft plan/SEIS, and how can I submit comments?**

Go to the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) website at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan> to review and comment online.

Copies of the plan are also available at libraries in San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo Counties, and the East Bay (full list at [www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm](http://www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm)).

The draft plan/SEIS is available for review and comment for 90 days; September 6 until midnight Mountain Time (**11 p.m. Pacific Time**), December 4, 2013.

Comments may be submitted:

- Online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan>; or
- By mail or other delivery to Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Building 201, Fort Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123, Attn: Dog Management SEIS
- By attending one of the public open-house meetings in early November (listed at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan> and at [www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm](http://www.nps.gov/goga/seis.htm))

Comments will not be accepted by fax, email, or in any other way than those specified above. Bulk comments in any format (hard copy or electronic) submitted on behalf of others will not be accepted. Before including a personal address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in a comment, reviewers should be aware that the entire comment—including personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While reviewers can ask us in their comment to withhold their personal identifying information from public review, the NPS cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

For questions about commenting, call the Dog Management Information line (415-561-4728) and leave a message and call-back number. Park staff will respond to your call.

### **3. Why has GGNRA developed a second EIS for dog management?**

The park received 4,713 individual pieces of correspondence, containing 8,000 substantive comments, on the 2011 draft plan/EIS. This draft plan/SEIS responds to those substantive comments and includes analysis of dog management for the newest area of the park, Rancho Corral de Tierra. Because of the amount of new information and analysis, the entire document has been reissued. The draft plan/SEIS includes a Reader's Guide, available with the online version of the document, to help direct reviewers to the substantive changes in the document.

In this public comment phase, we need to hear from a broad range of users as to whether the preferred alternative in the draft plan/SEIS adequately provides a range of visitor experiences while protecting park resources within this unit of the national park system.

### **4. What's in the draft plan/SEIS?**

The plan includes six management alternatives, one of which is the park's preferred alternative, for 22 areas of the park. These 22 areas include all the major areas where dog walking currently occurs and essentially lays out the future for where and how dog walking will occur parkwide.

### **5. What is a Preferred Alternative?**

A preferred alternative is the alternative in an EIS which the NPS believes would best accomplish the purpose and need of the proposed action while fulfilling its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical, and other factors. 43 CFR 46.4.20(d).

The preferred alternative in the draft plan/SEIS includes the following:

- On-leash and/or off-leash, voice-control dog walking in certain, specific areas of the park where impacts on visitor experience and safety and sensitive resources were minimal,
- No dogs in areas of the park where impacts were unacceptable and could not be mitigated,
- The commercial dog walking recommendation from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee,
- A monitoring-management strategy to guide a range of park responses to non-compliance,
- Permits for private or commercial dog walkers who wish to walk more than three dogs, with a limit of 6, in seven specific areas of the park.

### **6. What are the key changes between the 2011 draft plan/EIS and this draft plan/SEIS?**

- Addition of new data
- Consideration of additional research

- Some changes to the impacts analysis
- Changes to the management strategy to accentuate monitoring and eliminate automatic triggers
- Evaluation of fencing as a tool to manage dog impacts
- Changes to the preferred alternative at several sites, and site specific alternatives and analysis for Rancho Corral de Tierra in San Mateo County, which was not part of the park when the draft plan/EIS was developed.

**7. Does the draft plan/SEIS ban dogs from the park?**

No. The dog management planning process dismissed alternatives banning dogs from the park as not meeting the purpose of the planning effort. The range of alternatives in the draft plan/SEIS permits dog walking, both on leash and off-leash under voice control, in many areas of the park. The preferred alternative includes 7 areas, including beaches, where dogs may be walked off-leash under voice control and 22 park sites with areas (beaches, trails and grassy areas) open to on-leash.

**8. Are there any other national park areas that allow off leash dog walking?**

No. The national NPS regulation on dogs states that where dog walking is permitted in parks, dogs must be on leash.

In 2002, a panel of senior NPS officials concluded that because of the special circumstances at Golden Gate, it is appropriate for the park to consider off-leash dog walking in areas that meet certain criteria.

**9. Was there public input in the development of the plan?**

Yes. The plan is informed by the input of thousands of people over a 12-year period. Public involvement took the form of numerous public meetings, written comments, stakeholder presentations and discussions, and a federal negotiated rulemaking process. Most recently, the draft plan/EIS was open for public comment for 5.5 months and the park received over 4700 pieces of correspondence. Additional input came from senior NPS management at the regional and national level, with specialized expertise in resources and park management.

**10. Will the NPS really give consideration to public comment on the draft plan/SEIS?**

Yes. Every substantive comment will be carefully considered in developing a final plan/EIS. Without exception, every draft EIS released by the park since it was established in 1972 was refined and improved as a result of public comment.

**11. The draft plan/SEIS is very long. Do I have to read the entire document?**

No. We have prepared a Reader's Guide to reviewing the plan, available with the online version of the draft plan/SEIS, which will direct you to the sections that have changed

since the draft plan/EIS. There is also a short Executive Summary of the plan, which is the first 28 pages of the document. If you're interested in a particular area, see the index listings for Chapter 2 for descriptions of the alternatives and then go to the listing of alternative maps to see the alternatives for each site(s).

**12. Is the draft plan/SEIS the final dog walking regulation for GGNRA?**

No. The draft plan/SEIS is an assessment of the environmental impacts of a range of management alternatives, including the NPS Preferred Alternative. After review of public comment on the draft plan/SEIS and any resulting changes to the preferred alternative, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking will be published for additional public comment. After consideration of the relevant comments on the proposed rule, and after publication of the final plan/EIS and Record of Decision, the NPS will publish a final rule, which is anticipated in late 2015.



## ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

### 13. Does the draft plan/SEIS address all lands within the boundary of GGNRA?

The draft plan/SEIS addresses dog walking in 22 sites of the approximately 20,000 acres within the GGNRA boundary that are managed by the park. It does not address lands within the park boundary managed by other agencies such as the Presidio Trust, Point Reyes National Seashore or the San Francisco Public Utility Commission.

Other GGNRA managed lands within the park boundary that are not specifically covered in this draft plan/SEIS will continue to be governed by the existing NPS regulation for dog walking, 36 CFR 2.15 which requires dogs to be kept on a leash where they are allowed.

### 14. How were those 22 specific areas chosen for inclusion in the draft plan/SEIS?

Initially, 21 park areas were developed by the NPS as the parameters for discussion of dog management by the GGNRA Negotiated Rulemaking Committee for Dog Management, an initial attempt to develop a new dog walking regulation for the park with direct input from stakeholder groups. The parameters set the limits for discussion, by identifying, up front, areas that would be open to consideration for on-leash dog walking, areas open to consideration for dog walking off-leash, under voice control, and areas that would not be open to consideration for dog walking. Development of the parameters was guided by a panel of senior NPS officials who, in 2002, recommended the following to the park's General Superintendent:

*"The panel concludes that off-leash dog walking in GGNRA may be appropriate in selected locations where resource impacts can be adequately mitigated and public safety incidents and public use conflicts can be appropriately managed. The panel further recommends that the park pursue both rulemaking and comprehensive planning for pet management to address suitable locations and proper management strategies."*

An additional area, Rancho Corral de Tierra, was added in this draft plan/SEIS. That site transferred to the park when the draft plan/EIS had already been completed. The draft plan/SEIS provides the opportunity to specifically address that new property.

### 15. What are the current rules governing dog management at GGNRA?

Currently, dog management at GGNRA varies by area and is a combination of the following:

- NPS federal regulation (36 CFR 2.15) — requires that dogs be on leash wherever dog walking is permitted in an NPS area,
- GGNRA Citizen Advisory Commission's 1979 Pet Policy — recommending off-leash dog walking in certain areas of GGNRA. This aspect of current park

management is the result of the 2005 federal court decision *US v. Barley* (405 F. Supp.2d 1121 (N.D. CA 2005)),

- NPS special regulation for protection of western snowy plovers on Ocean Beach and the WPA at Crissy Field (36 CFR 7.97(d)), and
- GGNRA Compendium (compilation of park-specific rules).

**16. What is the 1979 Pet Policy?**

The GGNRA Citizen's Advisory Commission's 1979 Pet Policy recommended to the park that certain, specific areas of GGNRA be open to off-leash voice control dog walking. Although the park was never able to formalize this policy as a federal regulation, this unofficial pet policy was in place within GGNRA for more than 20 years.

**17. Why doesn't GGNRA simply adopt the 1979 Pet Policy as its dog management regulation?**

Conditions within the park have changed significantly since 1979; increased visitation, addition of park areas and increased knowledge of resources within the park must be taken into consideration in the development of any dog management regulation. An NPS rule must also be consistent with applicable statutory requirements, such as the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act. However, the 1979 Pet Policy was developed without any environmental analysis. In addition, the draft plan/SEIS found that accepting the 1979 Pet Policy in its entirety would not meet the purpose and need of the plan; therefore, formalizing the Pet Policy as the dog management regulation was considered but dismissed.

**18. What are the concerns about current off-leash dog walking in GGNRA?**

Although the 1979 Pet Policy and current park information state that dogs off-leash in the park must be under control, the park has no legally-enforceable voice-control guidelines governing off-leash behavior, and currently many off-leash dogs are not well-controlled by their walkers. Uncontrolled, off-leash dogs create safety issues for park visitors, staff, and other dogs, and are a source of conflict between dog walkers and other user groups.

**19. What is the definition of voice and sight control dog walking that would be required under a new GGNRA dog walking regulation?**

As defined in the draft plan/SEIS, voice and sight control means that dogs must be within direct eyesight of the dog walker, and that dog walkers must be able to immediately recall their dog(s) to their side so that a leash can be attached to the dog(s)'s collar, and shall demonstrate this ability when requested by Law Enforcement personnel. This definition is similar to other land management agencies that allow off-leash dog walking.

**20. Why does the GGNRA draft plan/SEIS treat dog walking differently than other areas of the National Park Service?**

The November 2002 Federal Panel Recommendation to the General Superintendent on Proposed Rulemaking for Pet Management at GGNRA noted that the park has a unique set of characteristics. Those characteristics are: sites which had historically been used for off-leash dog walking; the GGNRA Citizen's Advisory Commission 1979 Pet Policy that recommended the continuation of those uses, and the park's adoption of that policy for over 20 years; and management of a significant portion of the public recreational open space in San Francisco and San Mateo and Marin Counties, where residents rely on portions of that open space for exercise of their pets.

Because of these unique characteristics, the park considered a range of alternatives intended to provide a variety of experiences, including voice control dog walking, while protecting visitor experience and safety and park resources.

**21. GGNRA is a national recreation area. Do national recreation areas have different management policies than national parks?**

No. All units of the national park system are guided by the same NPS Management Policies, regardless of the park's designation as a national park, national recreation area, national historic site, national lakeshore or other (there are 35 types of national park units). Congress amended the 1916 NPS Organic Act in 1970 to make clear that the NPS must manage all units of the national park system to the same preservation standard.

**22. What is "Negotiated Rulemaking," and why did GGNRA use this form of rulemaking from 2006-2007 as a preliminary step in the dog management planning process?**

Negotiated Rulemaking is one way that federal agencies can develop rules. This method requires the formal involvement of key stakeholders, together with the agency. Given the longstanding and passionate interest that various stakeholders have in this issue, and because GGNRA has a deep tradition of community engagement, the park saw value in working in partnership with stakeholders who have diverse values and views to try and develop a rule for dog management through consensus. The Committee was formed with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to develop consensus recommendations for both voice-control and on-leash dog walking, as well as for use and limits of professional dog walking.

**23. What was the outcome of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee for Dog Management and how will recommendations of the Committee be used by the NPS?**

The Committee worked from March 2006 to the end of October 2007 but, after many meetings and working sessions, was unable to reach consensus on a proposed rule for all areas open for discussion. However, there was consensus on overarching guidelines for

dog management and commercial dog walking as well as for a management option for one site – Oakwood Valley. All these areas of consensus have been included in two of the alternatives in the draft plan/SEIS, and two are included in the NPS preferred alternative. Although the Committee was unable to reach consensus on a full rule, the many meetings of the Committee provided much information that aided the NPS in the development of the draft plan/SEIS.

**24. What should people consider when they comment on the draft plan/SEIS?**

The NPS is looking for substantive comments after review of the range of alternatives, including the preferred alternative, and the impacts of those alternatives. Examples of substantive comments include providing additional factual information, noting issues or impacts NPS may have failed to consider, inconsistencies, and other comments of substance, as opposed to comments voicing like or dislike without an underlying rationale.

**25. Once a final rule is issued, how will it be enforced?**

The park will enforce the final rule as it does all other rules. But in addition, the park will depend on the active involvement of user groups to support implementation of the rule by assisting in education and outreach to their members.

# Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement



Dear Park Friend,

Thank you for your continued interest in dog management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Following review of the public comments received on the 2011 draft plan/EIS, the National Park Service (NPS) determined that a number of changes were necessary to be fully responsive to public comment. Because of newly available information and some changes to the proposed action, a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) has been prepared and is being released for a 90-day public comment period.

Releasing the draft plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (draft plan/SEIS) at this time gives you the opportunity to provide comments on the new details in the plan. Your comments will help inform the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, final plan/FEIS, and Record of Decision, and the Final Rule for dog management in GGNRA. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking will be published in the Federal Register after comments on this draft plan/SEIS have been fully analyzed.

Your input on the draft plan/SEIS is an important step in developing the best solution for dog management that both allows a variety of visitor experiences and protects resources in this unit of the National Park Service. We look forward to your thoughtful review and comments.

Sincerely,

Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area

## What Has Changed in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement?

The park will accept all comments related to the dog management plan, but we encourage you to focus your comments on the changes in the draft plan/SEIS that were made as a result of comments on the 2011 draft EIS. Changes in this Supplemental EIS include the following:

- site specific analysis for Rancho Corral de Tierra
- new data and references, including scientific studies and law enforcement and visitor use data
- additional *Americans with Disabilities Act* elements and analysis
- changes to the impacts analysis, including additional analysis of potential redistributive effects
- changes to the compliance-based management strategy (now called the monitoring-based management strategy) that remove automatic triggers and restrictions and add natural and cultural resource monitoring
- adjustments to dog walking access for five sites in the preferred alternative

## Where Can I View the Draft Plan/SEIS?

Digital copies are available for download, online at: <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan>  
Reference copies of the draft plan/SEIS are also available at the following locations:

### *San Francisco Public Libraries*

Main Library  
Chinatown Branch  
Marina Branch  
Mission Branch  
Potrero Branch  
Richmond/Senator Milton Marks Branch  
Sunset Branch

### *Marin County*

Marin County Free Library, Civic Center Branch  
Marin County Free Library, Corte Madera Branch  
Marin County Free Library, Fairfax Branch  
Marin County Free Library, Marin City Branch  
Sausalito Public Library

### *San Mateo County*

Pacifica Sharp Park Library  
San Mateo County Library, Half Moon Bay Branch  
Daly City Public Library, Westlake Branch

### *East Bay*

Oakland Main Library  
Berkeley Central Library

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY DIVISION  
PO Box 25287  
DENVER CO 80225-0287

FIRST-CLASS MAIL  
POSTAGE & FEES PAID  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
PERMIT NO. G-83

OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300



## Golden Gate National Recreation Area Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties, California

September 2013

National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior



### Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Dog Management Open for Public Comment

The National Park Service announces a 90-day public comment period for the Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (draft plan/SEIS). Public comment will be accepted through December 4, 2013 (10:59 PT/11:59MT). You may provide comments in any of the following ways:

- Attend any of the public open house meetings;
- Comment online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/dogplan>; or
- Mail comments to Frank Dean, General Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Building 201, Fort Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123-0022.

Comments will not be accepted by fax, email, or in any other way than specified above. Bulk comments in any format (hard-copy or electronic) submitted on behalf of others will not be accepted.

Please be aware that your entire comment – including your personal identifying information – may be publicly available at any time. Although you may request in your comment that we withhold your personal information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

#### Public Meetings

**Saturday, November 2**  
11:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.  
Fort Mason Center  
Fleet Room, Building D  
San Francisco, CA 94123

**Monday, November 4**  
4:30 pm - 8:30 pm  
Farallone View Elementary School  
1100 LeConte Avenue  
Montara, CA 94037

**Wednesday, November 6**  
4:00 - 8:00 pm  
Tamalpais High School  
Ruby Scott Gym  
700 Miller Avenue  
Mill Valley, CA 94941