

File No. 110410

Committee Item No. 5

Board Item No. 3

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Economic Development Date April 11, 2011

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date April 26, 2011

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form (for hearings) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | * Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Alisa Somera Date April 7, 2011
Completed by: Alisa Somera Date April 12, 2011

An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 25 pages.
The complete document can be found in the file.

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