



I wrote this letter (not published) in response to this Chronicle image.

Editor - One of the best examples of just how dire and out of control the dog situation is in the GGNRA was the photograph that accompanied the "Criminalizing the dogs" letters. The caption said, "A dozen dogs are taken for a stroll on the beach at Crissy Field" when in fact there are at least eighteen dogs that are clearly on an explosive, free ranging romp. What you don't see is any hint of wildlife. You will also not see anyone that is rationally apprehensive of large groups of strange dogs or anyone legitimately requiring the assistance of a guide dog.

It's imperative that GGNRA management heed their legal mandate and realign this park with it's underlying intent.

Personal Experiences and Useful Comparisons

Although I live in San Francisco, I do most of my daily recreating on San Bruno Mountain, a California State Park that is administered by the San Mateo Parks system. Like all San Mateo Parks, there is a strict no dog policy on San Bruno Mountain, and I think the history behind this rule offers up some useful comparisons relevant to this discussion.

After more than a hundred years of contentious land use wrangling, San Bruno Mountain State and County Park was dedicated on May 2, 1986. The fact that pets have never been allowed at any of the San Mateo County Parks meant that San Bruno Mountain was now a no dog park. Just like much the GGNRA, San Bruno Mountain has a long history of extreme abuse such as off road motorcycles and extensive trash dumping, and of course the people that lived

Attached here is one of many letter on this subject I've had published over the years in the Chronicle.

San Francisco Chronicle Letters To The Editor

Monday, January 24, 2011

Protect our precious parks from the dogs

As soon as I saw the headline suggesting that dogs may be banned from some GGNRA parks ("Federal plan would leash, ban dogs in many parks," Jan. 13), I could hear echoes of past public forum shouting matches, and judging by The Chronicle's unfortunate choice of letters on the subject, we can look forward to even more shouting.

Although I now have a much better understanding of just how impassioned and motivated dog owners really are, I remain bewildered by a Bay Area community that, while cherishing the mantle of enlightened environmentalism, still sees a dog chasing a bird into the sunset as wholesome, harmless recreation and an appropriate national park activity.

I sincerely hope that the National Park Service will demonstrate enough courage to follow its lawful mandate to preserve and protect our precious park resources.

Once that happens, park visitors will be amazed at just how many wild and wonderful creatures will again appear as if to illuminate the original intent behind our parks.

M. Bruce Grosjean, San Francisco

Superintendent Dean - Your Chronicle profile printed last April pointed out that you grew up in the San Diego area so I know you're aware of the well enforced ban on dogs on most southern California beaches. It's ironic that even though these areas are densely populated and the beaches are crowded with people, I usually have far better luck photographing shorebirds in Los Angeles that I do up here. The fact that there are no dogs chasing birds affords opportunities rarely ever experienced in San Francisco.

I photographed these migrating Elegant Terns in Newport Beach last December. I await the day that wildlife viewing on Ocean Beach is equally available, and there's absolutely no reason that shouldn't happen. I'm sure the birds would appreciate the change even more.

Sincerely - M. Bruce Grosjean

