

1 [Opposing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area’s Currently Proposed Draft Off-Leash  
2 Policy and Supporting the On-Going Dialogue between GGNRA and San Francisco]

3 **Resolution putting the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on record opposing Golden**  
4 **Gate National Recreation Area’s currently proposed preferred alternatives for dog**  
5 **management and supporting the on-going dialogue between GGNRA and San**  
6 **Francisco to achieve an improved plan.**

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

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

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

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

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

22 WHEREAS, In 1979, after an extensive period of public comment including public  
23 hearings, the GGNRA determined that voice-controlled dog walking would have no negative  
24 impact on the natural environment or on other park visitors when conducted on one percent of  
25

1 the GGNRA land, and the GGNRA therefore determined that dogs could be walked under  
2 voice control on that one percent of its land; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

1           WHEREAS, The Animal Control and Welfare Commission advised the Board of  
2 Supervisors that the GGNRA dog management plan does not adequately take into account  
3 the impact of its preferred alternative on a possible increase in problem dog behaviors as a  
4 result of the loss of so much off-leash, voice-control areas and resulting overcrowding in city  
5 parks, and therefore does not consider the impacts of an increase in surrenders at city  
6 shelters because of problem behaviors, and a possible resulting increase in euthanasias at  
7 city shelters; now, therefore, be it

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

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

16           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors recognizes that  
17 in recent weeks, the GGNRA has engaged and consulted with City departments and officials  
18 about this issue, including attending a Land Use Committee hearing on the subject and  
19 listening to public comment, meeting with City Officials to discuss their concerns, and showing  
20 a greater willingness to engage in public dialogue on the issue, and, be it

21           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors welcomes this  
22 additional engagement, consultation, and public dialogue, and hopes that this leads to an  
23 improved plan that meets the needs of both the GGNRA and San Francisco, and, be it

24           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges the  
25 Recreation and Park Department to submit a substantive response to the GGNRA's Dog

1 Management Plan, detailing the Department's concerns about potential impacts on San  
2 Francisco parks, with documented facts supporting said response; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges the  
4 National Park Services to respond in similar detail, and by amending the Dog Management  
5 Plan, if an unmitigated impact on San Francisco's neighborhood parks is determined to occur;  
6 and, be it

7 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges both the  
8 Recreation and Park Department and the National Park Service to work collaboratively to  
9 ensure that the needs and interests of all San Francisco residents, dogs, and wildlife are  
10 properly evaluated and considered; and be it

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

22  
23  
24  
25