

1 [Opposing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area’s Draft Off-Leash Policy]

2

3 **Resolution putting the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on record as opposing the**  
4 **Golden Gate National Recreation Area’s preferred alternatives for dog management.**

5

6 WHEREAS, Approximately 110,000 households in San Francisco own dogs that  
7 require regular exercise; and

8 WHEREAS, San Francisco dogs have traditionally enjoyed access to various  
9 properties under the present oversight of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
10 (GGNRA), such as Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, Ft. Funston, Lands End, Ft. Baker, Ft. Mason,  
11 Baker Beach and Sutro Heights Park; and

12 WHEREAS, The GGNRA was established to provide for the “maintenance of needed  
13 recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning”; and

14 WHEREAS, In 1975, the City and County of San Francisco transferred Ft. Funston,  
15 Ocean Beach and other city-owned lands to the federal government to be included in the  
16 GGNRA and administered by the National Park Service; and

17 WHEREAS, The voters required that the deed transferring any City-owned park lands  
18 to the NPS include the restriction that said lands were to be reserved by the Park Service in  
19 perpetuity for recreation or park purposed with a right of reversion upon breach of said  
20 restriction; and

21 WHEREAS, In 1979, after an extensive period of public comment including public  
22 hearings, the GGNRA determined that voice-controlled dog walking would have no negative  
23 impact on the natural environment or on other park visitors when conducted on one percent of  
24 the GGNRA land, and the GGNRA therefore determined that dogs could be walked under  
25 voice control on that one percent of its land; and

1           WHEREAS, People, dogs, birds, plants and other species have been co-existing in the  
2 GGNRA for decades; and

3           WHEREAS, On January 15, 2011 the GGNRA released a “Dog Management Plan” that  
4 would severely curtail off-leash, voice-controlled dog walking and create large areas where  
5 dogs would not be allowed at all in areas that currently allow off-leash, voice-control dog  
6 walking at Ft. Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, Lands End, and Baker Beach; and

7           WHEREAS, The dog management plan would not only curtail dogs, it would eliminate  
8 from the GGNRA a main group of recreational park users – people who recreate in the  
9 GGNRA with their dogs; and

10           WHEREAS, The dog management plan does not adequately take into account the  
11 impact of its preferred alternative (or any alternative) on San Francisco city parks and city  
12 residents, specifically, that severe restrictions on off-leash dog access in GGNRA will result in  
13 an increase in off-leash dog activity in City parks; and

14           WHEREAS, The dog management plan does not include any consideration of the  
15 benefits of off-leash, voice-control dog walking, including providing needed exercise and  
16 socialization for dogs, nor does it include any consideration of the benefits of the social  
17 communities that have developed and flourished at GGNRA units such as Ft. Funston, and all  
18 other locations where dogs are currently walked off-leash and under voice control; and

19           WHEREAS, All of the dog management alternatives proposed by the GGNRA include a  
20 provision (called the compliance-based management strategy) that will automatically and  
21 permanently change remaining off-leash, voice-control areas in the GGNRA to on-leash or “no  
22 dogs at all” if the GGNRA claims there is not enough compliance with the new restrictions;  
23 and

24           WHEREAS, The Animal Control and Welfare Commission advised the Board of  
25 Supervisors that the GGNRA dog management plan does not adequately take into account

1 the impact of its preferred alternative on a possible increase in problem dog behaviors as a  
2 result of the loss of so much off-leash, voice-control areas and resulting overcrowding in city  
3 parks, and therefore does not consider the impacts of an increase in surrenders at city  
4 shelters because of problem behaviors, and a possible resulting increase in euthanasias at  
5 city shelters; now, therefore, be it

6 RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors opposes the GGNRA's  
7 preferred alternative for dog management and urges the GGNRA to delay taking action on its  
8 proposal until a thorough study is conducted of the affect that its proposal would have on the  
9 City of San Francisco and particularly on neighborhood parks; and, be it

10 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors opposes the  
11 inclusion of a compliance-based management strategy in any dog management plan because  
12 it denies the public a chance to comment on major changes in GGNRA usage before they  
13 take place; and, be it

14 FURTHER RESOLVED, That copies of this legislation be sent to GGNRA  
15 Superintendent Frank Dean, National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis, National Park Service  
16 Pacific-West Regional Director Christine Lehnertz, San Francisco Recreation and Park  
17 Director Phil Ginsburg, the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Commission, U.S. Senator  
18 Dianne Feinstein, U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer, U.S. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi,  
19 and Congresswoman Jackie Speier, Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, Chairman of the  
20 U.S. House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Rob Bishop,  
21 Ranking Minority Member of the U.S. House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and  
22 Public Lands Raul Grijalva, Chairman of the U.S. House Natural Resources Committee Doc  
23 Hastings, and Ranking Minority Member of the U.S. House Natural Resources Committee  
24 Edward Markey.

25