File No	111104	Committee Item No.	2	
		Board Item No.		

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee:	Land Use and Economic Development	_Date	December 12, 2011
Board of Su	pervisors Meeting	Date	
Cmte Boar	r d		
	Motion Resolution Ordinance Legislative Digest Budget Analyst Report Legislative Analyst Report Youth Commission Report Introduction Form (for hearings) Department/Agency Cover Letter and MOU Grant Information Form Grant Budget Subcontract Budget Contract/Agreement Form 126 – Ethics Commission Award Letter Application Public Correspondence	l/or Re	port
OTHER	(Use back side if additional space is	neede	d)
Completed k		Dece	mber 8, 2011

F	Ш	.Е	N	C	١.	1	1	1	1	0	4

ORDINANCE NO.

1	[Health Code - Regulating Commercial Dog Walkers on Park Property]					
2						
3	Ordinance amending the San Francisco Health Code by adding Article 39,					
4	Sections 39.01 through 39.13, to license and regulate Commercial Dog Walkers					
5	operating on park property.					
6	NOTE: Additions are <u>single-underline italics Times New Roman;</u>					
7	deletions are <i>strike-through italics Times New Roman</i> . Board amendment additions are <u>double-underlined;</u>					
8	Board amendment deletions are strikethrough normal .					
9	Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:					
10	Section 1. The San Francisco Health Code is hereby amended by adding Article 39,					
11	Sections 39.01 through 39.13, to read as follows:					
12	ARTICLE 39: COMMERCIAL DOG WALKING					
13	SEC. 39.01. DEFINITIONS.					
14	For the purpose of this Article 39, the following words and phrases shall mean and include:					
15	(a) "City." The City and County of San Francisco.					
16	(b) "Commercial Dog Walking" or "Commercial Dog Walking Business." Doing business as a					
17	permittee under this Article 39.					
18	(c) "Department." The Animal Care and Control Department of the City and County of San					
19	Francisco.					
20	(d) "Director." The Director of the Animal Care and Control Department, or his or her					
21	designee.					
22	(e) "Enforcement Officer." (1) An officer or employee of the Department designated by the					
23 .	Director to enforce this Article 39; (2) an officer or employee of the Port of San Francisco, the					
24	Recreation and Park Department, or the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("SFPUC")					
25	designated by the Port Director, the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, or the					
	Supervisor Wiener BOARD OF SUPERVISORS Page 1					

10/18/2011

v:\legis support\electronic attachments\2011 - ad files\111104.docx

General Manager of the SFPUC, respectively, to enforce this Article 39 on property under the jurisdiction of the Port, Recreation and Park, or the SFPUC, respectively; or (3) any peace officer.

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

"Park Property" shall also include property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco
that the Port Commission has designated for inclusion under this Article 39, and property under the
jurisdiction of the SFPUC that the SFPUC has designated for inclusion under this Article 39.

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

SEC. 39.02. PERMIT REQUIRED.

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

SEC. 39.03. APPLICATIONS FOR PERMIT.

- (a) Every person desiring a permit under this Article 39 shall file an application with the Director upon a form provided by the Department and pay a non-refundable permit fee.
 - (b) An application for a permit shall specify:
 - (1) The name and proposed business address of the applicant;
- (2) Whether or not the applicant has ever been convicted of any crime involving the mistreatment of animals and if so convicted, the place and court in which the conviction was had, the

Supervisor Wiener **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

1	specific charge under which the conviction was obtained, and the sentence imposed as the result of said
2	conviction;
3	(3) Such information pertinent to the operation of the proposed business as the Director
4	may require of an applicant in addition to the other requirements of this Section;
5	(4) The address to which notice, when required, is to be sent or mailed, and the name
6	and address of a person authorized to accept service of process, if not otherwise set forth herein; and,
7	(5) Whether the application is for a new permit or for the renewal of an existing permit.
8	(c) The application shall also include:
9	(1) A copy of a current valid City business registration certificate under Business and
10	Tax Regulations Code Section 853 for the proposed Commercial Dog Walking business;
11	(2) Proof of completion of the training required under Section 39.06;
12	(3) Proof of \$1 million in general liability insurance;
13	(4) Proof of inspection and approval of dogwalking safety equipment required under
14	<u>Section 39.07(e); and,</u>
15	(5) If the permit applicant will be transporting dogs by car in connection with a
16	Commercial Dog Walking business, proof of the vehicle inspection and approval required under
17	<u>Section 39.07(g).</u>
18	(d) Every application for a permit under this Article shall be verified as provided in the
19	California Code of Civil Procedure for the verification of pleadings.
20	
21	SEC. 39.04. PERMIT FEE.
22	(a) The Director shall set the amount of the permit fee required under Section 39.03(a) by
23	regulation adopted under Section 39.09.
24	
25	

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

(c) Beginning with Fiscal Year 2016-2017, and every fifth year after that, the Controller shall adjust the cap on the permit fee set in subsection (b) without further action by the Board of Supervisors, to reflect intervening changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index, as determined by the Controller.

No later than May 15th of each such year, the Controller shall file a report with the Board of Supervisors reporting the new fee cap and certifying that the amount of the cap does not exceed the costs of providing the services for which the fee is assessed.

SEC. 39.05. ISSUANCE OF PERMIT.

- (a) The Director may issue a permit within 21 days following the filing of a complete application as provided in Section 39.03 if he or she finds, based upon the contents of the application and his or her own investigation:
- (1) That the operation, as proposed by the applicant, if permitted, would comply with all applicable laws, including but not limited to, the City's Municipal Code.
- (2) That the applicant and any other person who will be directly engaged in the management and operation of a Commercial Dog Walking business has not been convicted in a court of competent jurisdiction, by final judgment of:
- (A) An offense involving the mistreatment of animals that amounts to a felony, or if committed without the State of California would amount to a felony if committed within the State of California, provided that the conviction occurred within the past ten years;
- (B) An offense involving the mistreatment of animals that amounts to a misdemeanor or infraction, or if committed outside of the State of California would amount to a

2

approve or disapprove, within 30 days of submission, any entity's proposal to offer the required Commercial Dog Walking training under subsection (a)(1) or (2).

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), any person who, on March 1, 2012, has held for at least the past three consecutive years a valid City business registration certificate under Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 853 for a dog walking business shall be deemed to have satisfied the training requirement of this Section. The Director may by regulation adopted under Section 39.09 determine which other equivalent occupational experience, if any, provides similar training and may be substituted for dog walking under this subsection (c).

SEC. 39.07. RULES FOR COMMERCIAL DOG WALKING.

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

- (a) The permittee may not walk more than 7 dogs at one time.
- (b) The permittee may only walk dogs currently licensed under Health Code 41.15.
- (c) The permittee must carry a leash for each dog, and follow all applicable on-leash rules.
- (d) The permittee must clean up after any dogs he or she is walking, as required by Health

 Code Section 40 and all applicable Recreation and Park Department rules and regulations.
- (e) The permittee must have dogwalking safety equipment, approved by the Director, either upon his or her person or at a nearby location, including in a vehicle, that is readily accessible.
- (f) The permittee must have sufficient drinking water for the dogs either upon his or her person or at a nearby location, including in a vehicle, that is readily accessible.
- (g) If the permittee transports dogs to or from Park Property, the permittee must do so in a safe and appropriate manner, including properly restraining the dogs while in open vehicles, and in a vehicle inspected and approved for this purpose by the Director; provided, however, that in any

disciplinary or enforcement action based on the inspection-and-approval requirement, if the Director finds good cause, he or she may grant the permittee up to 30 days to qualify a replacement vehicle.

SEC. 39.08. ADMINISTRATIVE INSPECTIONS.

- (a) Every permittee shall, while walking four or more dogs at any one time for consideration on Park Property, wear his or her permit so that it is readily visible to any enforcement officer.
- (b) If an enforcement officer has an objectively reasonable basis for suspecting that a permittee is transporting dogs by car in connection with a Commercial Dog Walking business and that the vehicle the permittee is using for that purpose has not been inspected and approved by the Director under Section 39.07(g), the enforcement officer may request the permittee to provide a copy of his or her vehicle inspection and approval from the Director and the permittee shall comply with the officer's request.
- (c) If an enforcement officer has an objectively reasonable basis for suspecting that a permittee does not have ready access to dogwalking safety equipment while walking four or more dogs at any one time for consideration on Park Property, and/or that the equipment has not been approved by the Director under Section 39.07(e), the enforcement officer may request the permittee to produce the equipment and provide a copy of his or her approval from the Director and the permittee shall comply with the officer's request.

SEC. 39.09. DIRECTOR'S REGULATIONS.

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

SEC. 39.10. LICENSE FEES.

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

 The license fee for new licenses issued during the calendar year shall be prorated with regard to the calendar year on a monthly basis.
- (b) The Tax Collector shall issue the license upon payment of the license fee required under subsection (a) and submission by the permittee of a verified statement, in a form provided by the Department, that the permittee is in compliance with all provisions of this Article 39 and any administrative regulations adopted under this Article.
- (c) The Director shall set the amount of the annual license fee by regulation adopted under Section 39.09. The Director shall base the amount of the fee upon the actual costs to the Department of administering and enforcing this Article 39, but shall not set the amount at greater than one hundred dollars (\$100).
- (d) Beginning with Fiscal Year 2016-2017, and every fifth year after that, the Controller shall adjust the cap on the license fee set in subsection (c) without further action by the Board of Supervisors, to reflect intervening changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index, as determined by the Controller. No later than May 15th of each such year, the Controller shall file a report with the Board of Supervisors reporting the new fee cap and certifying that the amount of the cap does not exceed the costs of providing the services for which the fee is assessed.

SEC. 39.11. SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION OF PERMIT.

- (a) The Director may suspend or revoke any permit issued under this Article 39 if he or she finds, after a noticed public hearing, that any of the following conditions exist:
- (1) Fraud, misrepresentation, or false statement contained in the application or permit, or any documents required in connection with them;

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[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.

Existing Law

The City currently does not regulate dog walking businesses, except that such businesses are subject to the City's general business registration and business tax laws.

Amendments to Current Law

The proposal is an ordinance that would amend the City's Health Code to license and regulate commercial dog walking businesses under the Animal Care and Control Department.

The ordinance would apply to "Commercial Dog Walkers", defined as persons walking four or more dogs at one time, for some sort of payment, in a City park, or on specified Port or PUC property.

Permit Requirement

The ordinance would require Commercial Dog Walkers to get a permit from the Animal Care and Control Department. Anyone applying for permit would have to have a City business registration certificate for the business, and proof of insurance.

The permit applicant would have to complete one of two training requirements:

- An approved training course including at least 20 hours of classroom and hands-on training on topics such as canine behavior, dog park etiquette, canine first aid, and local laws and regulations; or,
- A 40-hour apprenticeship with another licensed Commercial Dog Walker.

(The ordinance would waive the training requirement for anyone who, on the operative date of the ordinance, had held for the past three years a City business registration certificate for a dog walking business.)

If the permit applicant planned to transport dogs by car in connection with a Commercial Dog Walking business, the applicant would also have to submit proof that the vehicle had been inspected and approved for this use by the Director of the Animal Care and Control Department.

The Director of Animal Care and Control could charge applicants a permit application fee not to exceed \$250. (A Commercial Dog Walker would also have to pay an annual license fee, not to exceed \$100.)

Rules for Commercial Dog Walking

The ordinance would set rules of conduct for Commercial Dog Walkers, such as:

- A permittee could not walk more than 7 dogs at one time;
- A permittee would have to a leash for each dog, and follow all applicable onleash rules;
- A permittee would have to clean up after any dogs he or she was walking;
- A permittee would have to either carry dog walking safety equipment, such as canine first aid supplies, or have such equipment available at a nearby location; and,
- A permittee would have to either carry sufficient drinking water for the dogs, or have drinking water available at a nearby location;

Implementation and Enforcement

The City would begin enforcing the ordinance April 1, 2012. Prior to that date, the Director of Animal Care and Control would conduct a public outreach and education campaign to alert dog walkers and the public about the requirements of the new law.

After April 1, 2012, the Director could suspend or revoke a Commercial Dog Walker's permit, after a noticed public hearing, for misconduct such as breaking state or local law regulating the treatment of animals, or serious physical mistreatment of any animals under the permittee's control.

A person violating the ordinance could face criminal charges, or administrative fines imposed by the Director ranging from up to \$50 for the first violation to up to \$500 for a third or subsequent violation within a twelve-month period.

Animal Care and Control would maintain on its website a list of all persons who had been punished for violating the ordinance during the last three years.

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

2/27/08

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Planning Department

Environmental Review Officer

FROM:

Gail Johnson, Assistant Clerk

DATE:

October 27, 2011

cc: Nannie Turrell, Major Environmental Analysis

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

Referral - Fees

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.

Brett Bollinger, Major Environmental Analysis RESPONSE FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT - Date: 10/31/11 Non-physical activity not subject to CERA per Guidelines Section 15000(002). No Comment **Recommendation Attached** Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer 2011. 1226E



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>, "Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org" <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org" <Malia.Cohen@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", "John.Avalos@sfgov.org" <David.Campos@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