AMENDED IN BOARD
4/26/11

FILE NO. 110410 RESOLUTION NO. 183-11

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

City and County of San Francisco
Tails
Resolution

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 110410 **Date Passed:** April 26, 2011

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

April 11, 2011 Land Use and Economic Development Committee - RECOMMENDED AS COMMITTEE REPORT

April 12, 2011 Board of Supervisors - CONTINUED

Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Cohen, Elsbernd, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Mirkarimi and Wiener

April 26, 2011 Board of Supervisors - AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING NEW TITLE

Ayes: 10 - Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Mirkarimi and Wiener
Noes: 1 - Elsbernd

April 26, 2011 Board of Supervisors - NOT AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING NEW TITLE

Ayes: 2 - Elsbernd and Mirkarimi

Noes: 9 - Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar and Wiener

April 26, 2011 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED AS AMENDED

Ayes: 10 - Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Mirkarimi and Wiener
Noes: 1 - Elsbernd

File No. 110410

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED AS AMENDED on 4/26/2011 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

UNSIGNED

Mayor Edwin Lee

5/6/11

Date Approved

Date: May 6, 2011

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, became effective without his approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter.

Clerk of the Board

File No.
110410