Resolution opposing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) currently proposed preferred alternative for dog management; and urging the GGNRA to adopt a different approach.

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

WHEREAS, San Franciscans and their dogs have traditionally enjoyed access for generations 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, among other things, “to create an area that concentrates on serving the outdoor recreation needs of the people of the metropolitan area;” and

WHEREAS, In 1975, the City and County of San Francisco transferred Fort 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 after being given assurances that recreational access and usage would be continued and protected; and

WHEREAS, The voters required that the deed transferring any City-owned park lands to the National Park Service include the restriction that said lands were to be reserved by the Park Service in perpetuity for recreation or park purposes 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, consistent with the recreational purposes of the GGNRA; and
WHEREAS, On January 15, 2011, the GGNRA released a "Dog Management Plan"
that would severely restrict 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-controlled
dog walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, Lands End, and Baker Beach; and
WHEREAS, On April 26, 2011, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted
Resolution No. 183-11, putting the City and County of San Francisco on record as opposing
the GGNRA’s proposed preferred alternative for a “Dog Management Plan,” calling for a
thorough study of the GGNRA proposal’s impact on San Francisco and particularly on
neighborhood parks if severe restrictions on off-leash dog access in GGNRA result in an
increase of off-leash dog activity in City parks, and opposing the plan’s compliance-based
management strategy; and
WHEREAS, Public comment on the 2011 GGNRA Dog Management Plan was
overwhelmingly opposed to the GGNRA plan, and, in response, the GGNRA announced that
it would release a revised version of the Dog Management Plan; and
WHEREAS, On September 6, 2013, the GGNRA released a “Supplemental Dog
Management Plan” that included only minor changes to the original plan, and that still would
severely restrict off-leash, voice-controlled dog walking and create large areas where dogs
would not be allowed at all, including restrictions in areas where off-leash, voice-controlled
dog walking is currently allowed; and
WHEREAS, The Supplemental Dog Management Plan would still significantly reduce in the GGNRA a main group of recreational park users – people who recreate in the GGNRA with their dogs; and

WHEREAS, The Supplemental Dog Management Plan still does not include any consideration of the benefits of off-leash, voice-controlled dog walking, including providing needed exercise for people and dogs, nor does it include any consideration of the benefits of the social communities that have developed and flourished at GGNRA units such as Fort Funston, and all other locations where dogs are currently walked off-leash and under voice control; and

WHEREAS, A significant reduction in dog access at GGNRA will have negative impacts on many residents of San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, The Supplemental Dog Management Plan in its preferred alternative proposes restrictions on off-leash, voice-controlled dog walking access at GGNRA that are inconsistent with the purposes of the GGNRA to promote urban, recreational uses by San Franciscans; and

WHEREAS, The Supplemental Dog Management Plan does not contain a thorough analysis of impacts of the plan on San Francisco neighborhood parks as requested in Resolution No. 183-11; and

WHEREAS, The Supplemental Dog Management Plan still contains a compliance-based management strategy that, even though no longer automatic, nevertheless creates a process that penalizes all dog owners and walkers through progressive diminution of access to the already limited recreational space available, rather than citing and penalizing individual offenders; and

WHEREAS, By severely reducing access to places where people can recreate with their dogs in the GGNRA, the Supplemental Dog Management Plan does not reflect or
support the National Park Service’s “Healthy Parks, Healthy People” initiative, introduced in 2011, which was designed to improve the health and fitness of an increasingly obese and unfit population by encouraging people to recreate in their local parks and recreation areas; and

WHEREAS, The GGNRA Draft General Management Plan, released in September 2011, calls for the vast majority of its land, including the southern two-thirds of Ocean Beach and most of Fort Funston, to be managed as “nature zones” that provide “backcountry types of visitor experiences,” defined in the plan as “a sense of remoteness and self-reliance,” “low visitor use,” “controlled access,” few amenities, where “challenge, risk, and testing of outdoor skills would be important to most visitors;” and

WHEREAS, A “backcountry types of visitor experience” is not appropriate as the dominant use for a national recreation area located in a highly urban area such as the GGNRA; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco opposes the GGNRA’s proposed preferred alternative for a Supplemental Dog Management Plan and urges the GGNRA to modify the Plan to allow for greater access to recreational opportunities such as dog walking, or alternatively to adopt the No Action alternative that would continue the current usage for off-leash, voice-controlled dog walking in: (i) those places where it was allowed in the 1979 Pet Policy, and (ii) on GGNRA lands (San Mateo County properties) acquired after 1979; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco reiterates its belief that the GGNRA is an urban recreation area and not a remote national park and that the GGNRA should be managed with the needs of recreational users very much in mind; and, be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, That given the complexity and length of the Plan, additional time for comment and analysis (until early 2014) should be allowed before the GGNRA takes action on the Plan; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the GGNRA should create a regular recreation roundtable through a private public partnership, where different user groups can address and resolve visitor concerns; 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, Congresswoman Jackie Speier, Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell, 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 Peter DeFazio.
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