

File No. 111104

Committee Item No. _____

Board Item No. 20

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee _____

Date _____

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date 1/31/12

Cmte Board

- Motion
- Resolution
- XX** Ordinance
- Legislative Digest
- Budget Analyst Report
- Legislative Analyst Report
- Introduction Form (for hearings)
- Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
- MOU
- Grant Information Form
- Grant Budget
- Subcontract Budget
- Contract/Agreement
- Award Letter
- Application
- Public Correspondence

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

Completed by: Renee Craig

Date 1/26/12

Completed by: _____

Date _____

An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 20 pages. The complete document is in the file.

[Health Code - Regulating Commercial Dog Walkers on Park Property]

Ordinance amending the San Francisco Health Code by adding Article 39, Sections 39.01 through 39.13, to license and regulate Commercial Dog Walkers operating on park property.

NOTE: Additions are *single-underline italics Times New Roman*; deletions are *strike-through italics Times New Roman*. Board amendment additions are double-underlined; Board amendment deletions are ~~strikethrough normal~~.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Health Code is hereby amended by adding Article 39, Sections 39.01 through 39.13, to read as follows:

ARTICLE 39: COMMERCIAL DOG WALKING

SEC. 39.01. DEFINITIONS.

For the purpose of this Article 39, the following words and phrases shall mean and include:

(a) "City." The City and County of San Francisco.

(b) "Commercial Dog Walking" or "Commercial Dog Walking Business." Doing business as a permittee under this Article 39.

(c) "Department." The Animal Care and Control Department of the City and County of San Francisco.

(d) "Director." The Director of the Animal Care and Control Department, or his or her designee.

(e) "Enforcement Officer." (1) An officer or employee of the Department designated by the Director to enforce this Article 39; (2) an officer or employee of the Port of San Francisco, the Recreation and Park Department, or the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("SFPUC") designated by the Port Director, the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, or the

1 General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission SFPUC, respectively, to enforce this Article 39
2 on property under the jurisdiction of the Port, Recreation and Park, or the Public Utilities
3 Commission SFPUC, respectively; or (3) any peace officer. An officer or employee of the
4 Department designated by the Director to enforce this Article may refer possible violations
5 occurring on Port, Recreation and Park, or Public Utilities property to designated enforcement
6 officers from those departments, who shall have primary responsibility for enforcement of the
7 Article on properties under their respective jurisdictions.

8 (f) "Park Property." All grounds, roadways, avenues, squares, recreation facilities, and other
9 property placed under the control, management and direction of the Recreation and Park Commission
10 by the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, and the open space on the blocks bounded by
11 Market, Folsom, Third and Fourth Streets which is under the control, management and direction of the
12 Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco, otherwise known as the "Yerba Buena
13 Gardens."

14 "Park Property" shall also include property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco
15 that the Port Commission has designated for inclusion under this Article 39, and property under the
16 jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission SFPUC that the General Manager of the Public
17 Utilities Commission SFPUC has designated for inclusion under this Article 39.

18 (g) "Tax Collector." The Tax Collector of the City and County of San Francisco.

19
20 **SEC. 39.02. PERMIT REQUIRED.**

21 It shall be unlawful for any person to walk ~~four~~ two or more dogs at any one time for
22 consideration on Park Property without first having obtained a permit under this Article from the
23 Director of the Animal Care and Control Department.

1 SEC. 39.03. APPLICATIONS FOR PERMIT.

2 (a) Every person desiring a permit under this Article 39 shall file an application with the
3 Director upon a form provided by the Department and pay a non-refundable permit fee.

4 (b) An application for a permit shall specify:

5 (1) The name and proposed business address of the applicant;

6 (2) Whether or not the applicant has ever been convicted of any crime involving the
7 mistreatment of animals and if so convicted, the place and court in which the conviction was had, the
8 specific charge under which the conviction was obtained, and the sentence imposed as the result of said
9 conviction;

10 (3) Such information pertinent to the operation of the proposed business as the Director
11 may require of an applicant in addition to the other requirements of this Section;

12 (4) The address to which notice, when required, is to be sent or mailed, and the name
13 and address of a person authorized to accept service of process, if not otherwise set forth herein; and,

14 (5) Whether the application is for a new permit or for the renewal of an existing permit.

15 (c) The application shall also include:

16 (1) A copy of a current valid City business registration certificate under Business and
17 Tax Regulations Code Section 853 for the proposed Commercial Dog Walking business in the name
18 of the proposed permittee or the permittee's proposed employer;

19 (2) Proof of completion of the training required under Section 39.06; and,

20 (3) Proof of \$1 million in general liability insurance;;

21 (4) Proof of inspection and approval of dogwalking safety equipment required
22 under Section 39.07(e); and,

23 (5) If the permit applicant will be transporting dogs by car in connection with a
24 Commercial Dog Walking business, proof of the vehicle inspection and approval required
25 under Section 39.07(g).

1 (d) Every application for a permit under this Article shall be verified as provided in the
2 California Code of Civil Procedure for the verification of pleadings.

3
4 **SEC. 39.04. PERMIT FEE.**

5 (a) The Director shall set the amount of the permit fee required under Section 39.03(a) by
6 regulation adopted under Section 39.09.

7 (b) The Director shall base the amount of the fee upon the actual costs to the Department of
8 processing the application and of administering and enforcing this Article 39, but shall not set the
9 amount at greater than two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250).

10 (c) Beginning with Fiscal Year 2016-2017, and every fifth year after that, the Controller shall
11 adjust the cap on the permit fee set in subsection (b) without further action by the Board of Supervisors.
12 to reflect intervening changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index, as determined by the Controller.
13 No later than May 15th of each such year, the Controller shall file a report with the Board of
14 Supervisors reporting the new fee cap and certifying that the amount of the cap does not exceed the
15 costs of providing the services for which the fee is assessed.

16
17 **SEC. 39.05. ISSUANCE OF PERMIT.**

18 (a) The Director may issue a permit within 21 days following the filing of a complete
19 application as provided in Section 39.03 if he or she finds, based upon the contents of the application
20 and his or her own investigation:

21 (1) That the operation, as proposed by the applicant, if permitted, would comply with
22 all applicable laws, including but not limited to, the City's Municipal Code.

23 (2) That the applicant and any other person who will be directly engaged in the
24 management and operation of a Commercial Dog Walking business has not been convicted in a court
of competent jurisdiction, by final judgment of:

1 (A) An offense involving the mistreatment of animals that amounts to a felony, or
2 if committed without the State of California would amount to a felony if committed within the State of
3 California, provided that the conviction occurred within the past ten years;

4 (B) An offense involving the mistreatment of animals that amounts to a
5 misdemeanor or infraction, or if committed outside of the State of California would amount to a
6 misdemeanor or infraction if committed within the State of California, provided that such person
7 committed three separate offenses within the past five years.

8 (3) That the applicant has not knowingly made any false, misleading, or fraudulent
9 statement of facts in the permit application or any other document required by the Director in
10 connection with the application.

11 (b) Only one Commercial Dog Walking permit shall be issued to any one person.

12 (c) No Commercial Dog Walking permit shall be transferable.

13 (d) The permit shall be delivered to the applicant by the Tax Collector upon the payment to the
14 Tax Collector of the license fee required under Section 39.10.

15
16 **SEC. 39.06. TRAINING.**

17 (a) All applicants for a new permit must first satisfy one of the following two training
18 requirements:

19 (1) The applicant shall complete an approved training course consisting of at least 20
20 hours of classroom and hands-on training in the following areas: canine behavior, pack management,
21 dog park etiquette, safety and fight protocols, local laws and regulations, canine first aid, and any
22 other subject or subjects that the Director may determine is or are relevant to the health and safety of
23 animals and the public in the conduct of a Commercial Dog Walking business; or,

24 (2) The applicant shall complete an approved apprenticeship program consisting of at
25 least 40 hours of practical experience working with another dog walker who (A) is doing business as a

1 permittee under this Article 39, and (B) has operated a dog walking business, with a valid City
2 business registration certificate under Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 853 (or
3 equivalent license or certification from another jurisdiction, as accepted by the Director), for at
4 least three years. The person or organization providing the apprenticeship program may, but
5 is not required to, charge the applicant for the program. The apprenticeship program shall
6 cover each of the subject areas identified for training in subsection (a)(1), and the person or
7 organization providing the apprenticeship program shall provide the participant who
8 successfully completes the program with written certification that those subjects have covered
9 as part of the apprenticeship. The permit applicant shall provide the Director with a copy of
10 such certification along with his or her permit application.

11 *(b) Within ~~120~~ 30 days of the effective date of this ordinance, the Director shall adopt*
12 *regulations setting forth the required content of a course under subsection (a)(1) or the criteria for an*
13 *approved apprenticeship program under subsection (a)(2). After adoption of such regulations, the*
14 *Director shall approve or disapprove, within 30 days of submission, any entity's proposal to offer the*
15 *required Commercial Dog Walking training under subsection (a)(1) or (2).*

16 *(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), any person who, on ~~September~~ March 1,*
17 *2012, has held for at least the past three consecutive years a valid City business registration certificate*
18 *under Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 853 for a dog walking business (or equivalent*
19 *license or certification from another jurisdiction, as accepted by the Director), or any person*
20 *who as of that date has worked as a dog walker for such a business for at least the past three*
21 *consecutive years, shall be deemed to have satisfied the training requirement of this Section. The*
22 *Director may by regulation adopted under Section 39.09 determine which other equivalent*
23 *occupational experience, if any, provides similar training and may be substituted for dog walking*
24 *under this subsection (c).*

1 SEC. 39.07. RULES FOR COMMERCIAL DOG WALKING.

2 The following restrictions shall apply to a permittee while walking ~~four~~ ~~two~~ or more dogs at
3 any one time for consideration on Park Property:

4 (a) The permittee may not walk at one time more than ~~8~~ ~~7~~ dogs for consideration.

5 (b) Once a year, the permittee must distribute to all his or her current clients
6 informational materials to be prepared by the Department regarding how the clients may
7 license their dogs under Health Code Section 41.15 and the importance of doing so. At the
8 same time, the permittee must ask all of her or his clients for the license numbers for any of
9 their dogs that have been licensed under Health Code Section 41.15, and the permittee shall
10 keep a record of those numbers. The permittee may only walk dogs currently licensed under
11 Health Code 41.15.

12 (c) The permittee must carry a leash for each dog, and follow all applicable on-leash rules.

13 (d) The permittee must clean up after any dogs he or she is walking, as required by Health
14 Code Section 40 and all applicable Recreation and Park Department rules and regulations.

15 (e) The permittee must have dog walking safety equipment, approved by the Director, either
16 upon his or her person or at a nearby location, including in a vehicle, that is readily accessible. The
17 Director shall adopt regulations addressing what constitutes appropriate dog walking safety
18 equipment.

19 (f) The permittee must have sufficient drinking water for the dogs either upon his or her person
20 or at a nearby location, including in a vehicle, that is readily accessible.

21 (g) If the permittee transports dogs to or from Park Property, the permittee must do so in a safe
22 and appropriate manner, including properly restraining the dogs while in open vehicles. The Director
23 shall adopt regulations addressing what constitutes safe and appropriate transportation of
24 dogs, and in a vehicle inspected and approved for this purpose by the Director; provided,
25 however, that in any disciplinary or enforcement action based on the inspection and approval

1 requirement, if the Director finds good cause, he or she may grant the permittee up to 30 days
2 to qualify a replacement vehicle.

3
4 **SEC. 39.08. ADMINISTRATIVE INSPECTIONS.**

5 (a) Every permittee shall, while walking ~~four~~ two or more dogs at any one time for
6 consideration on Park Property, carry wear his or her permit upon his or her person and produce
7 the permit for inspection upon request by so that it is readily visible to any enforcement officer.

8 (b) If an enforcement officer has an objectively reasonable basis for suspecting that a permittee
9 is transporting dogs by car in connection with a Commercial Dog Walking business in an unsafe or
10 inappropriate manner and that the vehicle the permittee is using for that purpose has not been
11 inspected and approved by the Director under Section 39.07(g), the enforcement officer may
12 request the permittee to allow the officer to inspect the permittee's provide a copy of his or her
13 vehicle inspection and approval from the Director and the permittee shall comply with the officer's
14 request.

15 (c) If an enforcement officer has an objectively reasonable basis for suspecting that a permittee
16 does not have ready access to dogwalking safety equipment while walking ~~four~~ two or more dogs at
17 any one time for consideration on Park Property, and/or that the equipment has not been
18 approved by the Director under Section 39.07(e), the enforcement officer may request the
19 permittee to produce the equipment for inspection and provide a copy of his or her approval from
20 the Director and the permittee shall comply with the officer's request.

21
22 **SEC. 39.09. DIRECTOR'S REGULATIONS.**

23 The Director may, after a noticed public hearing, adopt administrative regulations
24 supplemental to this Article 39 and not in conflict therewith. Except in cases of emergency, the
25 regulations shall become effective no sooner than 10 days after adoption by the Director.

1 **SEC. 39.10. LICENSE FEES.**

2 (a) Every person who has received a permit to operate a Commercial Dog Walking Business
3 shall, on March 31 of each year, pay to the Tax Collector an annual license fee payable in advance.

4 The license fee for new licenses issued during the calendar year shall be prorated with regard to the
5 calendar year on a monthly basis.

6 (b) The Tax Collector shall issue the license upon payment of the license fee required under
7 subsection (a) and submission by the permittee of a verified statement, in a form provided by the
8 Department, that the permittee is in compliance with all provisions of this Article 39 and any
9 administrative regulations adopted under this Article.

10 (c) The Director shall set the amount of the annual license fee by regulation adopted under
11 Section 39.09. The Director shall base the amount of the fee upon the actual costs to the Department of
12 administering and enforcing this Article 39, but shall not set the amount at greater than one hundred
13 dollars (\$100).

14 (d) Beginning with Fiscal Year 2016-2017, and every fifth year after that, the Controller shall
15 adjust the cap on the license fee set in subsection (c) without further action by the Board of
16 Supervisors, to reflect intervening changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index, as determined by the
17 Controller. No later than May 15th of each such year, the Controller shall file a report with the Board
18 of Supervisors reporting the new fee cap and certifying that the amount of the cap does not exceed the
19 costs of providing the services for which the fee is assessed.

20
21 **SEC. 39.11. SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION OF PERMIT.**

22 (a) The Director may suspend or revoke any permit issued under this Article 39 if he or she
23 finds, after a noticed public hearing, that any of the following conditions exist:

24 (1) Fraud, misrepresentation, or false statement contained in the application or permit,
25 or any documents required in connection with them;

1 (2) Violation of provisions of this Article (other than Section 39.07(b)), the San
2 Francisco Municipal Code, or any regulations adopted by the Director under Section 39.09, or of any
3 of the laws of the State of California regulating the treatment of animals;

4 (3) Serious physical mistreatment by the permittee of any animals under his or her
5 control or custody; or,

6 (4) For any other good cause shown.

7 (b) On revocation of the permit no part of the annual license fee shall be returned and the said
8 license fee shall be forfeited to the City.

9
10 **SEC. 39.12. ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES.**

11 (a) Any person who violates any provision of this Article 39 (other than Section 39.07(b)) or of
12 an administrative regulation adopted under this Article shall be deemed guilty of an infraction and
13 upon conviction thereof such person shall be punished by a fine not to exceed one hundred dollars
14 (\$100) for a first violation, and not to exceed two hundred dollars (\$200) for a second violation of the
15 same provision or regulation within a twelve-month period. Upon the third or subsequent conviction
16 within a twelve-month period, such person shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be
17 punished by a fine not to exceed \$1,000 or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period not to
18 exceed one year or by both such fine and imprisonment.

19 (b) Any person who violates any provision of this Article 39 (other than Section 39.07(b)) or of
20 an administrative regulation adopted under this Article may be punished by administrative fines
21 imposed by the Director in the amount of:

22 (1) Up to \$50 for the first violation;

23 (2) Up to \$100 for a second violation within a twelve-month period; and,

24 (3) Up to \$500 for a third and subsequent violations within a twelve-month period.

1 (c) Except as provided in subsection (b), setting forth the amount of administrative fines,
2 Administrative Code Chapter 100, "Procedures Governing the Imposition of Administrative Fines," as
3 may be amended from time to time, is hereby incorporated in its entirety and shall govern the
4 imposition, enforcement, collection, and review of administrative citations issued by the Director to
5 enforce this Article or any administrative regulation adopted under this Article.

6 (d) The Department shall maintain on its website a list of all persons who have violated any
7 provision of this Article or of any regulation adopted under this Article three or more times in
8 the past 12 months been punished under this Section during the last three years.

9
10 **SEC. 39.13. OPERATIVE DATE; PUBLIC EDUCATION.**


11 The provisions of this Article 39 shall become operative and enforceable on January 1, 2013
12 April 1, 2012. The Director may postpone the operative date, not beyond July 1, 2013, by
13 posting a notice on the Department's website, if the Director determines that the City needs
14 additional time to successfully implement the provisions of this Article. During the period
15 between the effective date of the ordinance adopting these provisions and the operative date April 1,
16 2012, the Director and the Department shall conduct a public outreach and education campaign to
17 alert dog walkers and the public about the requirements of this Article.

18
19 Section 2. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days from the
20 date of passage.

21 / / /
22 / / /
23 / / /
24 / / /
25 / / /

1 Section 3. This section is uncodified. In enacting this Ordinance, the Board intends to
2 amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers,
3 punctuation, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent part of the Health Code that are
4 explicitly shown in this legislation as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and
5 Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title
6 of the legislation.

7
8 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
9 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

10 By: 
11 _____
12 THOMAS J. OWEN
13 Deputy City Attorney

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Department
Environmental Review Officer

FROM: Gail Johnson, Assistant Clerk

DATE: October 27, 2011

SUBJECT: REFERRAL FROM BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
City Operations and Neighborhood Services Committee

The Board of Supervisors City Operations and Neighborhood Services Committee has received the following, which is being referred to the Planning Department for determination as to whether the proposed fee increase will impact the environment.

Please provide your findings within 10 days from the date of referral.

File: 111104

Ordinance amending the San Francisco Health Code by adding Article 39, Sections 39.01 through 39.13, to license and regulate Commercial Dog Walkers operating on park property.

Please return this cover sheet with the Commission's response to Gail Johnson, Clerk, City Operations and Neighborhood Services Committee.

cc: Nannie Turrell, Major Environmental Analysis
Brett Bollinger, Major Environmental Analysis

RESPONSE FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT - Date: 10/31/11

No Comment
 Recommendation Attached

Non-physical activity not subject to CEQA per Guidelines Section 15060(a)(2).

Brett Bollinger
for Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer

Referral - Fees

2011.1226E 2/27/08



SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
EDWIN M. LEE, MAYOR

January 5, 2012

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
City Hall room 244
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Re: File No. 111104 [Health Code- Regulating Commercial Dog Walkers on Park Property]

Small Business Commission Recommendation: Approval

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On November 14, 2011, the Small Business Commission (SBC) unanimously voted 6-0 to recommend approval of Board of Supervisors File No. 110152 with modifications. The Commission supports regulation of this profession and finds that regulation will further professionalize an industry that has seen significant growth over the past several years.

Since SBC's November 14, 2011 meeting, a number of the Commissions recommendations, noted below, have been accepted as amendments. Therefore, after reviewing the accepted amendments, the Commissions recommendation is for the Board of Supervisors to approve the ordinance as currently drafted in version 2. The SBC commends Supervisor Wiener for his work in drafting the ordinance and for working with the Commission and stakeholders to refine the ordinance.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission proposed several modifications:

Delay the implementation date

There are logistical aspects of implementing of the program that will occur for both the business and the City that warrant a longer period between the effective date and operative date, such as, creating training programs, the potential upgrade and/or purchase of vehicles and accessories that meet requirements, potential reduction in the number of dogs a licensee may walk, and others. Additionally, businesses do need time to adjust their business model. This is an industry that was established with a fare amount of flexibility built in to its business model so that it could to provide for and accommodate their client needs. The Commission recommends a delayed implementation to allow these businesses the opportunity to effectively plan for the future.

Animal Care and Control will also require time to prepare and implement the program and appropriate

SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE CENTER/ SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 110 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
(415) 554-6408



SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
EDWIN M. LEE, MAYOR

staff must be brought online. The SBC did not provide a specified length of time between the adoption and operative date, but the Commission does recommend amending Section 39.13 to provide for additional implementation time.

This recommendation was accepted as an amendment in section 39.13 at the December 12, 2011 Land Use and Economic Development Committee meeting, extending the operative date from April 1, 2012 to January 1, 2013.

Allow 8 dogs per licensed dog walker

The SBC appreciates Supervisor Wiener working to find a balance between stakeholders on the number of paid dogs that a permittee may walk at a time. Significant written and in person public comment was made on this topic and after reviewing feedback, the Commission finds that 8 dogs is a reasonable and achievable number. This will be a reduction for many dog walkers and therefore will accomplish the goals of this ordinance. As with all new programs the Commission does recommend that one year after the ordinance is enacted, Department of Animal Care and Control report to the Commission and the Board of Supervisors on the status of achieving the results.

This recommendation was accepted by the Land Use and Economic Committee and adopted as an amendment at the December 12, 2011 Committee meeting.

Allow a personal non-compensated dog per licensed dog walker

The SBC determined that a number of dog walkers bring their personal animal on the walks with paid dogs. In addition to providing a healthier lifestyle for their personal animal, these dogs help control the pack and provide a fixed and steady presence for the paid dogs, whose makeup often change on a day to day basis. Therefore, the Commission recommends that the regulations on the number of dogs only apply to paid animals and that a personal animal not be counted towards the licensed dog walker's count.

This recommendation was accepted by the Land Use and Economic Committee and adopted as an amendment at the December 12, 2011 Committee meeting.

Work to establish an apprenticeship program

The Commission recommends that an apprenticeship program or established guidelines be implemented to provide guidance and uniformity in the apprentice process. This will ensure that new dog walkers received adequate training.

An amendment was accepted under section 390.06 at the December 12, 2011 Land Use and Economic Committee meeting. The language of the ordinance has provided direction on what training the program shall include and has ensured consistency and uniformity in both the training course and apprenticeship program.



SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
EDWIN M. LEE, MAYOR

Remove the requirement to wear the permit so that it is readily visible

While supported by a segment of the dog walking community, the Commission determined that this regulation is not necessary and may prove to be a safety concern as dogs may pull off the lanyard that accompanies the license.

This recommendation was accepted as an amendment at the December 12, 2011 Land Use and Economic Development Committee meeting.

Remove the requirement that only licensed dogs may be walked by licensed dog walkers

While the SBC supports the licensing of dogs, the Commission finds that obligating licensed dog walkers to verify and only walk licensed dogs is an onerous and un-necessary requirement. Dog walkers may voluntarily provide licensing information to dog owners, a practice that is already common.

This recommendation was accepted as an amendment at the December 12, 2011 Land Use and Economic Development Committee meeting.

Additional Director Recommendations/Notes:

Modify the requirement of having to have a business registration for 3 years to be grandfathered.

There are dog walkers that have apprenticed and/or worked for experienced dog walkers for well over 40 hours that now have their own business, but may have had their business registration certificate, for less than three years. I recommend that the Director of ACC have the flexibility to permit dog walkers with business registrations of less than 3 years apply the time spent apprenticing or working for another dog walker as long as it is equivalent to the 40 hours apprenticeship program.

This recommendation was not accepted; however Supervisor Wiener provided the Director of ACC some flexibility in accepting license or other types of permits from other jurisdictions.

Allow Dog walking businesses to have permitted employees.

When new regulations are developed for an industry/business sector, the Office of Small Business and Small Business Commission advise that the new regulations to be designed with flexibility to allow the industry to operate and grow in a manner that reflects the industry's needs.

Currently requiring all dog walkers to have a business registration assumes that there is only one type of business model for this business sector and that each dog walker is a sole proprietor and/or an independent contractor. While most likely the vast majority of dog walkers are and will be sole proprietors / independent contractor, the regulations drafted as is do not allow for any other business structures to exist. It will not allow for a dog walking business to grow with hired employees (and I understand there may be



SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
EDWIN M. LEE, MAYOR

one or two existing entities), but only through independent contractors. There for it is recommended that the department establishes a category of permittees that are permitted under their employer's business registration and the responsibility of the permit is with the employer.

This recommendation was accepted as an amendment at the December 12, 2011 Land Use and Economic Development Committee meeting.

Include independent dog walkers in drafting the guidelines for the apprenticeship program.

I like to request that the Department of Animal Care and Control also include input from independent dog walkers in drafting the guidelines for the apprenticeship program. From my many conversations with independent dog walks their contribution will strengthen the guidelines.

This recommendation is advisory and is not required to be in the ordinance.

Wage earning impacts.

While considering the impacts on potential wage earnings of a walker, in order to take a holistic view, please note that a majority of dog walkers have to provide for their own health insurance, do not receive vacation or sick pay and pay for their own state and federal taxes in addition to their business operational expenses.

This recommendation is advisory and is not required to be in the ordinance.

Sincerely,

Regina Dick-Endrizzi
Director, Office of Small Business

cc. Supervisor Wiener
Jason Elliott, Mayor's Office
Rebecca Katz, Animal Care and Control



Fw: Today's Land Use Committee: Requesting changes to Dog Walker legislation

Barbara Amato to: alisa.miller

01/09/2012 05:39 AM

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Barbara Amato <barbara_amato@sbcglobal.net>

To: Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org

Cc: chris@fundogsf.org; nickolas.pagoulatos@sfgov.org; Victor.Lim@sfgov.org; Andrea.Bruss@sfgov.org; adam.taylor@sfgov.org; gillan.gillett@sfgov.org; alicia.miller@sfgov.org; Sally Stephens

<sally.stephens.sf@gmail.com>

Sent: Mon, January 9, 2012 5:32:20 AM

Subject: Today's Land Use Committee: Requesting changes to Dog Walker legislation

Dear Supervisors Wiener, Cohen, and Mar,

I am representative of folks with one dog, who obey the rules and who clean up and maintain their neighborhood dog park.

Respectfully, as SFDOG has been asking for the past 8 years, please amend the proposed legislation to reduce the maximum number of dogs to 6 per professional dog walker for the entire City. But in any event, limit it to 6 in Upper Noe's small dog park, Joby's Run. And secondly, please consider amending your legislation to include 4 additional requirements for a professional dog walker's Revocable Permit to remain in good standing:

1. Issued dog walker Permits are to be worn and visible from 10 ft away.
2. The Permit Number is to be clearly displayed on pro dog walker's vehicle.
3. Every dog being walked must have a current dog license.
4. Dog walkers shall not use cell phones, sit, read or socialize while working - For dog safety and sanitation reasons.

Reasoning

For starters, dogs poop everywhere and no one dog walker manages to see it all from 9 dogs - let alone pick it up. Ask yourself - how difficult is it to manage 9 dogs off leash? It appears almost impossible to have the dogs under voice control, control dogs with a tendency to run in packs, and at the same time control aggressive dogs, timid dogs, old dogs, dogs waiting at the gate to leave, dogs in front of you and behind you. We are being forced to leave OUR neighborhood dog park because 9 additional dogs in so small a place encourages aggression and pack mentality. Further, the dogs don't have not enough room to keep a safe (comfort zone) distance from each other, and it is common for running dogs in close quarters to run too close to other dogs who get mad or they are startled and start a fight. It creates tension, an unsafe environment and is so unpleasant. And to add insult to injury, when returning to our dog park, we end up picking up the poop left behind, picking up trash and sweeping the walkways.

On top of it, we continue to see pro dog walkers distracted with talking on their cell phones, socializing or just sitting off on a bench away from the action. Professional dog walkers need to be made accountable to the public.

In closing, it may work at crissy field, but allowing 9 dogs with one dog walker in our small dog parks looks like irresponsible legislation to folks like me. And it is so frustrating that City Hall and especially Supervisor Wiener's good intentions have been hijacked by the professional dog walker lobby into passing legislation that clearly nobody likes but the dog walkers! It's not too late Supervisors Wiener, Cohen and Mar to amend this legislation and bring it back to where it

started with SFDOG and a maximum of 6 dogs.

Thank you for your consideration,

Barbara Amato

Dolores Street

Upper Noe Neighbors



PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE! ... FORWARD TO INDIVIDUAL REC AND
PARK COMMISSIONERS, SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, MAYOR ED LEE
! from V gilbert - V Gilbert <victorgilbert@mac.com> What I now experiences
WITH UPPER DOUGLAS DOG PARK, with off leash dogs running loose and
barking, 16hr daily (6 a.m. to 10 p.m.) 7 days week, 52 weeks, year

V Gilbert: to: ed.lee, kristin.bowman, melia.cohen, linda.avery, 01/05/2012 03:53 PM
alisa.miller, margaret.mcarthur, board.of.supervisors

Cc: V Gilbert

1 attachment



DOG BARK MIXON chartnoise.pdf

FROM WEB SITE :

BarkingDogs.net

PLEASE REVIEW THIS SITE.

LITERALLY, MY HEALTH AND LIFE ARE ON THE LINE!

WOULD ANY OF YOU LIKE 16 HOURS DAILY AT YOUR HOME?

I AM SUBJECTED TO OFF LEASH DOGS BARKING EMANATING JUST 50 FEET
FROM MY HOME ON DIAMOND HEIGHTS BLVD.

IT COMES FROM UPPER DOUGLASS DOG PARK. BARKING AND YAPPING FROM
6AM TO 10PM, 7 DAYS WEEK, EVERY DAY 365 DAYS

DOG WALKERS CANNOT CONTROL A FIST FULL OF DOGS, BARKING, WETHER
BEING PLAYFUL, OR AGGRESSIVE WITH OTHER DOGS.

SINCERELY

VICTOR GILBERT

V Gilbert <victorgilbert@mac.com>

The Symptoms & Side Effects Force-Feeding Noise into the Domestic Environment

Despite its reputation as a minor irritant, research has shown noise to be a debilitating and potentially lethal toxin. Hence, forcibly projecting noise into someone's living quarters in chronic fashion has the potential to disrupt their autonomic and endocrine functions severely enough to catapult the entire family into a state of frequent agitation and near constant distress, thereby setting in motion a predictable process of physical, mental, and emotional deterioration, accompanied by functional impairment and the severe disruption of interpersonal relationships. This chart delineates that process.

The immediate effect of an externally generated in-home noise inundation:

Increased heart rate	Respiration increases	Blood pressure increases	Shift in hormonal profile	Shift in electrolyte balance	Dry mouth	Goose bumps
Sweating	Pupils of the eye dilate	Changes in blood lipids	Altered blood viscosity	Altered blood flow	Cold hands	Cold feet
Digestion slows dramatically	Stomach upset	Loss of appetite	Transient sexual dysfunction	Tooth grinding	Bracing/muscle tension	Anxiety
Agitation	Irritability	Anger	Aggression	Interpersonal conflict	Discord within the family unit	Self-medicating
Functioning impaired	Physical coordination impaired	Accident rate potentiated	Error rate potentiated	Inability to think clearly	Judgment is impaired	Inability to make decisions

The impact of forcibly projecting noise into the home environment over time:

Autonomic disruption grows constant	Sense of constant tension	Endocrine disruption constant	Constant emotional upset	Emotional lability	Exaggerated startle response	Fear of being startled
Anticipatory anxiety	Uncontrollable rumination	Chronic anger	Chronic strife within the family	Chronic depression	Chronic disorganization due to constant disruption of scheduled activities	Schedule is adjusted so all activities revolve around the noise source
Noisy rooms of house abandoned	Uncontrollable rage	Increased risk of violence	Affectionate exchanges cease	Chronic sexual dysfunction	Social relationships abandoned	Social activities abandoned
Childhood learning impaired	Kids fall behind in school	Adult job performance dips	Upset over new job stress	Symptoms mimicking psychological disturbance develop	Difficulty falling asleep - even in a quiet environment	Difficulty staying asleep - even in a quiet environment
Chronic fatigue	Merriment becomes rare	Chronic restlessness	Concentration impaired	Memory impaired	Chronic muscle tension	Chronic muscle contraction headaches
Persistently recurring migraine headaches	Aversion to going outdoors	Regular exercise ceases	Once occasional high blood pressure now becomes chronic	Heart disease takes root	Old substance use increases	New substance use begins
Substance use solidifies	Marked consumption of Rx drugs	Reaction time is slowed	Accident rate increased	Sensitivity to noise is heightened	Family interactions grow dysfunctional	Children fall in school
Chronic overeating	Newfound overweight problem	Chronic loss of appetite	Newfound underweight problem	Chronic gastro-intestinal distress	Resilience wanes as adaptive capacity is diminished	Gums and dental health deteriorate
Ongoing hair loss	Exacerbation of pain	Worsening of preexisting maladies	Immune system dysfunction - increased risk of cold, flu, and infection	Increased risk of developing stress-related disorders	Increasing frequency of illness in general	Recuperation from illness hampered
Exhaustion	Heart palpitations	Classical conditioning generates secondary distress and discord	Abandonment of recreational activities	Abandonment of essential activities	Hopelessness/suicidal ideation	Premature aging

After years of being elevated due to noise force-fed into the home, chronic hypertension - the silent killer - wreaks irreversible damage.

End Organ Damage:

Enlarged heart	Heart attack	Heart failure	Hardening of the arteries	Aneurysm
Stroke	Dementia	Eye damage	Kidney damage	Total loss of sexual function

SOURCES:

The World Health Organization	The Journal of Experimental Medicine	The Garvan Institute of Sydney, Australia	The British Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine
The European Heart Journal	The research of Johns Hopkins University	The research of the Institute for Social Medicine of Berlin's Charite University Medical Centre	The Archives of Environmental Health
The United States Environmental Protection Agency	The British Medical Association		The research of Craig Mixon, Ed.D., BarkingDogs.net



File 111104: DOG WALKERS

Carmen Chu, David Campos, David
Board of Supervisors to: Chiu, Eric L Mar, John Avalos, Ross
Mirkarimi, Sean Elsbernd, Malia Cohen,

12/13/2011 12:31 PM

From: V Gilbert <victorgilbert@mac.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org,
Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org
Cc: V Gilbert <victorgilbert@mac.com>
Date: 12/12/2011 02:59 PM
Subject: DOG WALKERS

MS COHEN
MR MARR
MR WEINER

DEAR SUPERVISORS,

**SO FAR YOU HAVE NOT ADDRESSED THE ISSUES OF DOG BEHAVIOUR
RELATED TO DOG BARKING.**

**IT FALLS UNDER THE AREA OF DOG BEHAVIOUR AND CONTROLING DOG
PROPERLY.**

IT MUST BE ADDRESS NOW WITH THIS SCOTT WIENER LEGISLATION.

I AM RETIRED AND HOME DURING THE DAY.

**I LIVE 50 FEET ACROSS FROM UPPER DOUGLASS DOG PARK ON DIAMOND
HEIGHTS BLVD.**

WHICH HAS NOW BEEN A OFF LEASE PARK.

**MY HOME AND LIFE HAVE BE DESTROYED BECAUSE I HAVE NO PEACE EVER
WHAT ABOUT THE WELFARE AND WELL BEING OF ME AND MY HEALTH AND
PEACE?**

SUPERVISORS HAVE NOT

CONSIDERED THE IMPACT TO SURROUNDING HOMEOWNERS
AS I AM OVERWHELMED NOW WITH INCESSANT DOG BARKING FROM 6 am to 10
pm.

**DOGWALKER NOT CONTROLLING THE DOGS FROM BARKING IN RESIDENTIAL
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS**

SINCERELY

VICTOR GILBERT

NOW WATCHING ON CHANNEL 26

415-648-2204

Malia Cohen

District 10

(415) 554-7670 - Voice

(415) 554-7674 - Fax

Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org

Scott Wiener
District 8
(415) 554-6968 - Voice
(415) 554-6909 - Fax
Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org

Eric Mar
District 1
(415) 554-7410 - Voice
(415) 554-7415 - Fax
Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org



File 111104: Dog Permit Proposal and Dog Limitation
Peggy Nevin to: Alisa Miller

11/22/2011 12:41 PM

From: Jessica Chase <jlc571@yahoo.com>
To: "Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org" <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, "Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org" <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, "Jane.Kim@sfgov.org" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>, "Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org" <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, "Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org" <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org" <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, "David.Chiu@sfgov.org" <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, "David.Campos@sfgov.org" <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, "John.Avalos@sfgov.org" <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>
Date: 10/24/2011 10:10 PM
Subject: Dog Permit Proposal and Dog Limitation

Hello Supervisors -

I recently submitted an email to Scott Wiener on behalf of his fight for dog permits and limiting dog walkers to a certain number of dogs within San Francisco. I received an email from him today that lacked any sort of response to the questions and solutions I had. In fact, he decided to forward on my personal email to various people, which I see as highly inappropriate, simply because he couldn't respond (he should have sent me their email addresses for me to contact vs. forwarding a personal email with my information). Two of the three people I know, and work with, but I'm not looking for them to respond or even the third person he cc'd. I wrote to him because he needs to answer my questions since he is the one pressing so hard on this particular issue. Since he can't respond to me, I thought I would share my concerns with all of you.

I think the dog permit situation is a concern that should not be at the top of this city's list at this point in time. It's a waste of money and resources so I thought I would provide a better solution to what Wiener is trying to do. He's essentially capping all dog walkers income and putting us under the control of the city. I don't work for the city. I work for myself and I'd like to keep it that way.

Most walkers have been in favor of requiring permits for quite a while. There are a ton walkers in this city, but only around 140 have business licenses. To be held accountable for the land we use the service we provide, we've always thought walkers should be required to carry permits. However, the problem is, that Wiener wants to limit us to 7 dogs per walker. This is a major problem. I have been walking dogs for over five years now and I walk eight dogs at a time and then have my own with me during the day. I find this number to be just fine. I can handle the dogs on or off leash and they have plenty of space in the back of my Toyota Tacoma. In fact, I know I can walk 10 and say the same thing. I have done this various times. My problem is definitely stemming from a financial stand point. My clients aren't all from the upper class in this city; they are hard workers, putting in 60 plus hours a week. They are single moms trying to get by in an already tough economy. Limiting walkers to 7 dogs requires us to raise our prices. We have to make up for the lost income and therefore have to pass that on to our clients. It's not fair to have the ACC and Wiener say that one walker can't handle seven dogs. I invite any of them to come out with me and see that I can do that with absolute ease. To say all walkers can handle this would be a lie, but I think there are better solutions to controlling this than what Wiener is providing. I've outlined them below:

* Set up two different prices for permits. Those that do small groups of 1-6 dogs pay a smaller fee. Have the rest of us (7-10 dogs) pay a higher permit. Anything over 10 dogs is being

frowned upon, within our dog walking community, at a growing rate. Let us police each other.

* Set the permits at a higher price and don't monitor the dog limitation. I'd be happy to pay \$1000-2000 per year and be able to add a dog in if a client is in a jam, or has an emergency. If that dog is my 9th dog and I know I can safely care for this dog, let that be an option for me. I don't want to turn away business because of this ridiculous dog limit.

* A client of mine made a very valid point yesterday. This should be the owners job and decision when finding a dog walker. Ask the right questions and know how many dogs a walker takes out. If you don't want someone to take more than 6-8 dogs out, then you have the right to deny the job to them. It's their choice as owners. We are taking their property out and this should be a decision that they make. It's very simple. I have clients come walk with me as a part of the interview. I want them to see that I can handle the dogs. If I add another dog in to make my groups 9, they are comfortable with that because they've seen me out with my dogs. I have complete control on and off leash.

Wiener also wants he city to pay someone to inspect our vehicles. They want to ensure that the cars/trucks are safe for dogs. One woman who is helping the ACC says that trucks are the most dangerous vehicles b/c it creates chaos in the back. Really? My dogs are more than content having a good time playing in the back. If I get into an accident, I'd rather have them out of a crate and have the ability to get free vs. keeping them in a crate, which could further damage them in an accident. I've told all of my clients this and they agree. Again, this is the owners choice when they are interviewing us to take THEIR property out.

Another concern is why the ACC is helping decide how many dogs are safe with one walker? It's a city agency and they are extremely biased when it comes to walkers. In fact, they state that walkers can only handle 6 dogs/walker. My boyfriend came out with me last week and walked eight dogs. This is not his job and he did it no problem. In fact, my 7 year old niece came out and walked 7 dogs on leash with me. She did a fabulous job and had no trouble controlling the pack. The ACC shouldn't be allowed to help make this decision when they have no idea what our jobs require and how to do them properly.

As I stated before, this is just an added cost to the city/state to have someone, or some agency, ticket walkers for having more than the 7 dog limitation. Our city is broke and this is not where you should be spending time and resources. Right now, Wiener wants to charge \$250 for permits and have someone monitoring the amount of dogs we have. Who is going to be responsible for paying for this? The tax payers? Simply put a larger fee on the permits (say \$1000) and leave the dog limitation alone. That will generate more income for the city and state parks. If someone is caught without a permit, they could be fined. There are currently around 140 licensed dog walkers within the city (the ones operating without licenses usually don't have insurance and are the ones charging about \$10/walk). If permits are required, there will be about 300 plus dogs walkers registered with the city. The math is quite simple and it's easy to see that this would be a huge income generator for the city, not to mention a relatively small cost for walkers.

I thank you for your time and I hope I provided some insight from a responsible walker. I love my job, I'm good at my job and I don't feel like this should be made into this big issue. I think it can be done simply and then move on to bigger issues within SF.

Sincerely,

Jessica Chase

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

LAND USE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Economic Development Committee will a hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard

Date: Monday, January 9, 2012


Time: 1:00 p.m.

Location: Committee Room 263 located at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

Subject: File No. 111104. Ordinance amending the San Francisco Health Code by adding Article 39, Sections 39.01 through 39.13, to license and regulate Commercial Dog Walkers operating on park property.

If the legislation passes, a new permit application fee and annual license fee shall be established for Commercial Dog Walkers operating on park property. The permit fee amount shall be set by the Director of Animal Care and Control (Director) and based upon the actual costs to the Animal Care and Control Department (Department), but not exceed \$250. Every person who has received a permit shall pay an license fee to the Tax Collector on March 31 each year. The license fee shall be set by the Director based upon the actual costs to the Department, but not exceed \$100. Beginning with FY2016-17, and every fifth year thereafter, the City Controller shall adjust the caps on the permit fee and license fee to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index.

In accordance with Section 67.7-1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made a part of the official public record in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the Members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, Room 244, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place, San Francisco, 94102. Information relating to the proposed fee is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, January 6, 2012.


Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

DATED: December 21, 2011
PUBLISHED: December 29, 2011 & January 4, 2012

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E FIRST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (213) 229-5300 / Fax (213) 229-5481
Visit us @ WWW.DAILYJOURNAL.COM

Alisa Miller
S.F. BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL
NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE
Ad Description AM - 111104 Fee Ad

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

12/29/2011

Daily Journal Corporation

Serving your legal advertising needs throughout California. Call your local office.

- BUSINESS JOURNAL, RIVERSIDE (951) 784-0111
DAILY COMMERCE, LOS ANGELES (213) 229-5300
LOS ANGELES DAILY JOURNAL, LOS ANGELES (213) 229-5300
ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER 10%, SANTA ANA (714) 543-2027
ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, SANTA ANA (714) 543-2027
SAN DIEGO COMMERCE, SAN DIEGO (619) 232-3486
SAN FRANCISCO DAILY JOURNAL, SAN FRANCISCO (800) 640-4829
SAN JOSE POST-RECORD, SAN JOSE (408) 287-4866
SONOMA COUNTY HERALD-RECORDER, SANTA ROSA (707) 545-1166
THE DAILY RECORDER, SACRAMENTO (916) 444-2355
THE INTER-CITY EXPRESS, OAKLAND (510) 272-4747

EXM 2232806

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING LAND USE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS JANUARY 9, 2012 - 1:00 PM CITY HALL, COMMITTEE ROOM 263, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PL SF, CA
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Economic Development Committee will a hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard, File No. 111104, Ordinance amending the San Francisco Health Code by adding Article 39, Sections 39.01 through 39.13, to license and regulate Commercial Dog Walkers operating on park property. If the legislation passes, a new permit application fee and annual license fee shall be established for Commercial Dog Walkers operating on park property. The permit fee amount shall bes et by the Director of Animal Care and Control (Director) and based upon the actual costs to the Animal Care and Control Department (Department), but not exceed \$250. Every person who has received a permit shall pay an license fee to the TaxC ollector on March 31 each year. The license fee shall be set by the Director based upon the actual costs to the Department, but not exceed \$100. Beginning with FY2016-17, and every fifth year thereafter, the City Controller shall adjust the caps on the permit fee and license fee to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index in accordance with Section 67.7-1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made a part of the official public ecor d in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the Members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, Room 244, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place, San Francisco, 94102. Information relating to the proposed fee is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, January 6, 2012.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board



* A 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 7 4 5 1 1 *

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E FIRST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (213) 229-5300 / Fax (213) 229-5481
Visit us @ WWW.DAILYJOURNAL.COM

Alisa Miller
S.F. BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL
NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

CNS 2232805

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE
Ad Description AM - 111104 Fee Ad

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE. Please read this notice carefully and call us with any corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the Clerk of the Board. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

01/04/2012

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING LAND USE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS JANUARY 9, 2012 - 1:00 PM CITY HALL, COMMITTEE ROOM 263, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PL. SF, CA NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Economic Development Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard. File No. 111104. Ordinance amending the San Francisco Health Code by adding Article 39, Sections 39.01 through 39.13, to license and regulate Commercial Dog Walkers operating on park property. If the legislation passes, a new permit application fee and annual license fee shall be established for Commercial Dog Walkers operating on park property. The permit fee amount shall be set by the Director of Animal Care and Control (Director) and based upon the actual costs to the Animal Care and Control Department (Department), but not exceed \$250. Every person who has received a permit shall pay an license fee to the Tax Collector on March 31 each year. The license fee shall be set by the Director based upon the actual costs to the Department, but not exceed \$100. Beginning with FY2016-17, and every fifth year thereafter, the City Controller shall adjust the caps on the permit fee and license fee to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. In accordance with Section 67.7-1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made a part of the official public record in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the Members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, Room 244, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place, San Francisco, 94102. Information relating to the proposed fee is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, January 6, 2012. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Daily Journal Corporation
Serving your legal advertising needs throughout California. Call your local office.

- BUSINESS JOURNAL, RIVERSIDE (951) 784-0111
DAILY COMMERCE, LOS ANGELES (213) 229-5300
LOS ANGELES DAILY JOURNAL, LOS ANGELES (213) 229-5300
ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER 10%, SANTA ANA (714) 543-2027
ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, SANTA ANA (714) 543-2027
SAN DIEGO COMMERCE, SAN DIEGO (619) 232-3486
SAN FRANCISCO DAILY JOURNAL, SAN FRANCISCO (800) 640-4829
SAN JOSE POST-RECORD, SAN JOSE (408) 287-4866
SONOMA COUNTY HERALD-RECORDER, SANTA ROSA (707) 545-1166
THE DAILY RECORDER, SACRAMENTO (916) 444-2355
THE INTER-CITY EXPRESS, OAKLAND (510) 272-4747



