Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4774 **Comment Id:** 361493 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are proven to support mental health and workplace productivity. Off-leash areas are absolutely essential for the health of these dogs. For the love of all the hardworking, super smart, productive people and canines of the San Francisco Bay Area, we MUST preserve off-leash access. Any move to restrict off-leash access will likely be met with unnecessary and politically costly hostility.
Organization:
Commenter: Kristen Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4781 **Comment Id:** 361519 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Lastly, the most recent data that was released by the GGNRA (in 2013) shows that in the last year, out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people who own dogs, there have only been 6 reported dog bites; 5 reported dog fights; 2 cliff rescues; 2 reported cases where people were "scared" by a dog; 1 instance of a wildlife killing; and 1 horse bite incident. Reported incidents involving people are much higher than any statistic involving an incident with a dog. This data, released by the GGNRA, does not support the argument that there is a need for major change. This data also does not support the request for more rangers, which would cost another $2MM per year
Organization:
Commenter: Katherine Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4791 **Comment Id:** 361542 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA's mission is to provide access to nature for residents of an urban area. It's an essential mission - having open places that urban residents and visitors can enjoy and to foster taking care of our natural environment. AND, it's a fact that urban dwellers have pets who bring joy and companionship into their lives. These pets deserve space to enjoy fresh air and exercise. These elements are important components to good health and disposition.
Organization: retired
Commenter: Ann Sasaki **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4792 **Comment Id:** 361544 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Our daily off leash dog walks are the single most important component to my husband's and my daily exercise.
Organization: MDG
Commenter: Margaret P Kritzer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4797 **Comment Id:** 361555 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing in opposition to the Preferred Alternative. This plan is too restrictive. The GGNRA should be an area for all to enjoy equally. Taking away off leash areas and creating this limited access is unfair. I walk my dog off leash at Fort Funston and it is good for my health as well as my dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Phillip R Benedetti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4808 **Comment Id:** 361573 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The second large problem with allowing domesticated dogs to roam free concerns the unfortunate ability of the dog to drop a load of waste at almost any given moment. These dropping (feces) carry nasty pathogen and viruses that can be transmitted to wildlife and humans simply by coming in contact with the dropping. It matters little if the droppings are 'picked up' or not. The residue does remain and presents the possibility of human or wildlife contact.

Organization: Audubon Society-Marin County

Commenter: Richard A Fraites **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4815 **Comment Id:** 361579 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization: San Francisco citizen and dog owner

Commenter: Felicia J Zeiger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4816 **Comment Id:** 361582 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Theres an epidemic of obesity and other health problems in this country, many of which can be traced to a lack of exercise - recent studies indicate dog owners may get as much as 34% mre exercise than non-owners.. As a dog-owner yourself (are you still?), Im sure you understand how important owning a dog can be in addressing this issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Judith D Kucera **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4825 **Comment Id:** 361604 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Recreating with a dog is a common and healthy practice. It lifts our spirits and gets us out into the fresh air. Some people, especially the elderly, would not make the effort to go outside for a walk on a daily basis if not for the desire to take their best friend out for some necessary exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: Marla Miyashiro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4840 **Comment Id:** 361620 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The notion that $2,000,000 will need to be allocated for more rangers is not supported by the data. The numbers released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4857 **Comment Id:** 361640 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have never seen someone not picking up after their dog and think it's a travesty that you would remove these areas for dogs to run and play. Owning a dog leads to a healthier and happier life which has been proven through several research studies and in this day and age that is great to have.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4873 **Comment Id:** 361673 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are already so many people needing a place to hang out with their doggy besties, where on good days it is already almost near impossible to find parking and access, limiting the amount of area we have by a staggering 75% rally is cruelty and neglect for these animals, as well as their owners. I honestly believe that having these quality off leash areas promote healthy ownership of animals.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4907 **Comment Id:** 361761 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I use the GGNRA parkland at both Crissy Field and Fort Funston with my dog

regularly, and I am extremely upset by and strongly opposed to the preferred alternative described in the new draft dog management plan. It's way too restrictive, and will inhibit my ability to use this land to support mine and my dog's health and well-being as I have for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Barry R Perlman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4918 **Comment Id:** 361772 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a divorced woman I feel secure while walking with my dogs, and it is part of their joy to have time off leash. They are always within my voice control range.

Organization:

Commenter: Elia Haworth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4957 **Comment Id:** 361836 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A large portion of people and their dogs in the area use these parks to exercise their dogs, which in turns helps reduce destructive and aggressive tendencies in some dogs when properly exercised. I have never felt threatened or in danger at the dog park from a dog owner or their dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen K **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4963 **Comment Id:** 361856 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not only do my dogs need to run, I need to walk, being ridden with rheumatoid arthritis. Moving, walking allows me to be functional, working and out of pain. I remain in San Francisco because of all the gorgeous areas in which I am able to walk and my dogs run. PLEASE do not take away this from me and all the MANY dog owners and dogs (still more dogs per capita than anywhere else in the nation, I believe!).

Organization:

Commenter: Laura J Small **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5011 **Comment Id:** 361999 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We walk our dog (a Border Collie Mix) every day on the trails of Marin. This keeps us all both mentally & physically fit and is an important part of our daily routine.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa D **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5019 **Comment Id:** 362014 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog and family in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. This plan is very restrictive and will prevent me and my family from using the RECREATIONAL spaces with our dog in a way that supports our health and the health of our dog.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5045 **Comment Id:** 362109 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep our off leash dog areas! Our family relies on these parks for outings together, and we love being able to run around with kids and dogs together. It's great exercise for everyone!

Organization:

Commenter: Lauren E N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5050 **Comment Id:** 362119 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Most of the people with dogs have a special appreciation for the outdoors and tend to stay healthy physically and mentally; scientific studies back up the wonderful relationships between people and their pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer J Olson Spindell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5067 **Comment Id:** 362149 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our family has lived near the trailhead since 1999, and my wife has never felt safe to walk the trail either alone or with our two young children. There are just too many dog walkers (including professionals), who let their dogs off leash. I have been bitten while jogging the trail, and I can attest to feeling fear every time I am approached by a random dog there.

Organization:

Commenter: David S Swope **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5103 **Comment Id:** 362182 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I walk my dog regularly off leash via voice command in the GGNRA and I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft Dog Management Plan. For me, this plan is too restrictive and will prevent me from exercising with my dog, impacting not only my health, but the health of my dog.

Organization:
Commenter: Amy Puffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5132 **Comment Id:** 362260 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: \We both get so much exercise, and I find it to be a terrific stress reducer at the end of a work week. I have met more than one new friend while dog walking at Fort Funston, and having such a tremendous off-leash resource is a jewel in the city's crown.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher Fleitas **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5155 **Comment Id:** 362291 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs keep people healthy. They get people out walking and exercising in other ways too, and going to undeveloped areas with fresh air keeps the dogs keeping their people healthy.
Organization:
Commenter: Jewel L Rose **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4260 **Comment Id:** 362328 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The most recent data released by the GGNRA (2013) does not support the statement in the plan that says dogs cause major safety problems. In fact, during 2013 there were only 6 reported dog bites, 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 1 wildlife killing, 1 horse bite and 2 complaints where people were scared. This data does not support the need for more restrictions on dogs and certainly doesn't justify an additional $2 million per year for rangers.
Organization:
Commenter: Joanne A Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5177 **Comment Id:** 362451 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I live by 8th ave and Balbao ave in Inner Richmond and am 2 blocks from Golden Gate Park, where I frequent on a daily basis with my pet where I either a) run through the park with him, as well as play Frisbee/fetch. Not only do I get great exercise for both myself and my dog, but this is usually one of the highlights of my day.
Organization:
Commenter: Angeline Yap **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5181 **Comment Id:** 362504 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog waste is not environmentally friendly and can be classified as a health hazard even if it deposited in trash cans it still must be handled and removed safely from the area placing the additional burden of cost to the tax payer who might have a different opinion of dogs or animals; think and practice leave no trace in our natural public lands. Dog and animal owners should remove and pack out all waste on their own to include supplying and removing dog fecal matter disposal bags.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5185 **Comment Id:** 362523 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I make extensive use of GGNRA lands, especially in Marin County. Walking is an essential part of both my dog's health and my own. Off-leash exercise is critical to my dog's health and happiness.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen Gimber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5188 **Comment Id:** 362544 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have lived here and enjoyed walking in the GGNRA for 18 years, and I depend on these walks to keep fit and active. My dogs have kept me company and motivated to walk daily for the last 16 years.

Organization:

Commenter: Alice A Gleghorn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5190 **Comment Id:** 362549 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog walkers are the most frequent users of the beaches in all types of weather and thereby make it safer for others due to their constant presence.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian Kerester **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362636 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I hike alone, for exercise before work, and take my dog along for my own safety and security. We walk from our house, along the beach and up the Coastal Fire Road to the Coastal Trail and then back to my office in Muir Beach. If we have time, we go to Pirate's Cove. I would never be comfortable taking this hike alone if not for my dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5224 **Comment Id:** 362687 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Without off-leash recreation, I probably wouldn't have visited these parks more than 3-4 times a year. The opportunity to walk and enjoy nature with my dog is keeping this senior citizen fit and socially connected hundreds of other people who come to the park for off-leash recreation.
Organization:
Commenter: K Hu **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5262 **Comment Id:** 362830 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I feel safer when I can hike, bike, exercise in the company of my dog. Women are unfortunately vulnerable on the trail. Within the time I have lived in southern Marin women have been attacked on trails near my home.
Organization:
Commenter: Colleen Lenihan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5278 **Comment Id:** 362866 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Over the years, the benefits of the off-leash recreation areas have been clearly demonstrated, not only in terms of health benefits, but also by the harder-to-measure value added in terms of the cultural richness of the area. Bay area pet owners often cite the dog-friendliness as one of the most-valued attributes of the bay area's offerings.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5287 **Comment Id:** 362885 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My experience as a San Francisco resident is with Fort Funston. It is a great place and it is one of the first places new residents discover if they have a dog. It is a place where I have met people who I ended up dog sitting for. It is a community. I feel safe there walking alone. I feel safer there than in my own neighborhood.
Organization:
Commenter: Carola Hamann **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5299 **Comment Id:** 362916 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash walking is extremely beneficial for both pet owner and pet alike. It provides a sense of freedom that is not attainable on city streets or many of the other existing

parks in San Francisco. For me personally, it provides my primary source of exercise on a daily basis to hike at Fort Funston with my dogs. There are hundreds of people and their pets that will be displaced from an activity that is and should be available to them. Please consider the impact that it will have on the current and future dog owners as well as the neigbhorhoods and city parks that will see a large increase in dog activity.

Organization:

Commenter: Adam Damico **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5307 **Comment Id:** 362939 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Once there, Yoki gets to run freely under my voice control with her dog friends. It is so good for her health and for mine. She is a happy dog because she is able to run and play, then come back to me. And I am her happy human companion being witness to her pure joy. This off-leash freedom is something I can give her when she gives me so much every day. Without a large off-leash open area like Fort Funston I would not be able to allow my dog this kind of play time pleasure. Due to my illness I am not able to run with her to keep her exercised. So the off-leash freedom to run at Fort Funston in a safe area with other dogs is a godsend to my current life situation.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan L Damron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5309 **Comment Id:** 362947 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We need to preserve off leash recreation for the health and well being of our pets. This in turn will promote the health and well being of our citizenry as we can exercise ourselves as well as our pets. Restricting off leash areas is dangerous for all pf us as we all become less able to properly exercise our bodies along with our canine companions.

Organization:

Commenter: Marilyn Harrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5315 **Comment Id:** 362959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However I'm more concern with the dog feces left on sidewalks all over San Francisco, dog owners should have serious fines to discourage these areas especially poop visible on frequent public/common spaces/areas. There should be a night & early morning patrol giving out hefty fines to prevent dog owners & dogs from allowing this to continue.

Organization:

Commenter: Sourichanh Chanthyasack **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5321 **Comment Id:** 362968 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am certain that these free runs on the beach where she gets to play with many other dogs and people in a low stress environment, are a huge part of her excellent socialization that makes her a kind, obedient, and happy dog. It certainly goes a Kong way to keeping us both healthy. The bay area very much needs,our off leash spaces. There are so many dogs, and so many responsible pet owners counting on you to save our off leash areas. Please don't let us down. Please vote to keep them for all of us.

Organization:

Commenter: Traci Burleigh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5429 **Comment Id:** 363217 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the many times I've been to these parks, I haven't experienced any safety or off-leash dog misbehaviour hazard, dog to dog or dog to person. Dog owner's who take off the leash are well aware of their dog's need to be properly trained to begin with.

Organization:

Commenter: Ed Ramos **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5430 **Comment Id:** 363219 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is important for me that I can enjoy walks and hikes with my dog as I do now. I already feel limited in where I can hike with my dog. Don't let the few irresponsible owners ruin it for everyone. Hiking with your dog is so great for your health too. Please do not limit dogs anymore then they are!!

Organization:

Commenter: Mari Avedano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363301 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Stepping on dog feces numerous times. Seeing dogs putting ther feces on the beach while their owners are off in the distance. The new one- collecting their dog's feces in a plastic bag and leaving the bags in piles on the beach or on the paths. Not even the dencency to put it in a public garbage can!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5489 **Comment Id:** 363362 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The law requires a peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The data I have reviewed does not support it: in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been only 6 reported dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1

wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. Further, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5531 **Comment Id:** 363908 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash exercise and play is healthy for both the dog and the owner and also increases the owner/dog bond allowing a dog to become a balanced and healthy member of society.

Organization:

Commenter: Apryl A Guisasola **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5572 **Comment Id:** 363959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I frequent Fort Funston every week and have been for 10 years with my dogs. This is one of the best places for off leash dogs. I actually do not understand the reason for any ban on off leash dogs? In all my time spent there I have never seen a major altercation between dogs or dogs and humans. So why the ban?

Organization:

Commenter: Eric Chapman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5578 **Comment Id:** 363960 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I take my 3 pound Chihuahua for walks through Fort Funston and have never encountered any problems with other off leash dogs or owners. I have found the community to be considerate of eachother and of the area. We respect the site and treasure the opportunity to have this location. I feel safer today on my walks at Fort Funston than I did in years past when fewer people where there. Please dont change it.

Organization:

Commenter: Catherine Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5579 **Comment Id:** 363962 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We rely on the exercise and scenery to keep us active and agile. Being a shelter dog was tough on my dog. She does not do well in confined spaces such as a dog parks. She feels safest in open spaces and shows a profound change of character when at one of 'her' beaches. And because I'm out there enjoying my time with her this GGNRA proposal would in a real sense take away this space/exercise for me.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy R Adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5581 **Comment Id:** 363964 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not ban off lease dog play in the Bay Area. We have a large, thriving dog community here in San Francisco. It gives us the opportunity to socialize our dogs and exercise them in ways most other dense urban environments can't. It promotes healthy dogs and healthy people but getting both man and dog out and active.

Organization:

Commenter: Ryan M Sprinkle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5606 **Comment Id:** 364000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm not a dog owner, but I'm not a dog hater, either. But at Crissy Field and Ocean Beach, the off-leash dogs can be a nuisance. I cannot walk without off-leash dogs rushing up to me, or having to listen to owners shouting at their off-leash dogs to obey them. I came out to enjoy the scenery and to watch for birds, not to have to dodge dogs. Moreover, it isn't possible to bring a very small dog or a small child to these places due to the number of large dogs off leash: the owner may think the dog is friendly, but the rest of us have to take precautions with the safety of a small child or small dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen A Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5665 **Comment Id:** 364099 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am strongly opposed to the "Preferred Alternative" change to the GGNRA policies. The City and the GGNRA are safer because of the off-lease policies and, as I have stated before, there is absolutely no justification for the changes the GGNRA has been trying to force upon the residents for the last 29 years.

Organization:

Commenter: Faye Bernstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5675 **Comment Id:** 364109 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We need off-leash play areas in SF. I love taking my dogs to SF to the beach and to parks. Please keep off-leash areas for dogs to play fetch. It's good for their health and mine.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Novak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5701 **Comment Id:** 364165 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Personally speaking, I can think of no better way to decompress and normalize after a twelve hour shift of wailing sirens, pain, and illness than a morning walk with my dog off leash. Seeing my domesticated beast running free and happy is the best therapy I could ask for.
Organization:
Commenter: Lucas A Freshman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5724 **Comment Id:** 364187 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The main reason that these urban beaches and parks feel safe is the frequent sight of other dog walkers and other people enjoying the landscape.
Organization:
Commenter: Mark Ferree **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5727 **Comment Id:** 364189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Owning a dog builds community- it gets you outside every single morning and evening to see your neighbors who would otherwise only pass in cars or live behind closed doors. It leads to a healthier community, encouraging each other to stay active. But nothing compares to the joy of seeing a dog happily running in his element, joy that is absolutely contagious and makes our community a better place to live.
Organization:
Commenter: Beth L **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5729 **Comment Id:** 364198 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We rely on these off-leash parks to be able to exercise in areas of natural beauty, and also to keep us from adding to dog-parks that are over-crowded and small.
Organization:
Commenter: Audrey E Zmuda **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5783 **Comment Id:** 364298 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Recreation is a public health issue- and having spaces where people can exercise with their dogs encourages exercise, which as we know, greatly improves population health.
Organization: UCSF
Commenter: Nicole D Wilson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5803 **Comment Id:** 364333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I also visit areas, without a dog, just to enjoy the dogs playing. I frequent Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Mori Point and other areas. The exercise I gain from these walks is not obtainable in the vastly smaller space of my local city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael B Goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5803 **Comment Id:** 364337 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The presence of many people walking their dogs in the GGNRA adds to public safety. We should not be restricting this healthy form of recreation.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael B Goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5834 **Comment Id:** 364378 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Geoff Garinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5853 **Comment Id:** 364416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs and their humans need off leash time and deserve to enjoy the beauty our area has to offer. The health of dogs and their humans rely on this.

Organization:

Commenter: Amy L Allen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5884 **Comment Id:** 364460 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog is very sweet but gets incredibly nervous when on a leash. Furthermore, it is important that she (and I) get enough exercise, which can be very difficult since I can work long hours. Fenced in areas never allow for enough exercise, for either me or my pup.

Organization:

Commenter: Mantissa Johnston **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5919 **Comment Id:** 364633 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please save off leash areas- they are part of the culture and history of this beautiful city and are absolutely necessary for us to maintain a healthy life for our pets in the city. I am an urban planner living in San Francisco with a small dog and I do NOT support the ban on off-leash parks!

Organization:

Commenter: thalia leng **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5922 **Comment Id:** 364641 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs have shown to lower blood pressure and bring depressed persons joy just by being in their company....even if someone does not own a dog they get joy out of watching them play and watching them with their owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Steve J Baechtle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5925 **Comment Id:** 364648 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The health and well being that a relationship with a dog brings is immeasurable.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Corbett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5926 **Comment Id:** 364651 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As an elderly woman with arthritis and cancer, I feel more secure having my German Shepherd with me when I walk.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean F DeMouthe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5941 **Comment Id:** 364765 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: People who walk dogs are in better physical shape than other people (new study out of England). They are less of an expense on our health care system. We should be encouraging this!

Organization:

Commenter: Vivien MacDonald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5951 **Comment Id:** 364776 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Two years ago I was diagnosed with stage 3 breast cancer. To this day, the only

exercise I can do is walking which I only do with my two dogs. I cannot take them on leash because I cannot have them pull me and risk complications. Me, my entire family and our dogs would be significantly limited in our exercise, exposure to wilderness, and our outdoor family time if we are not able to take our dogs to these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Lori D Fineman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364793 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Human safety: In the Rancho area, the above four risk factors affect humans more than dogs do. In fact, I do not believe it is safe to hike the hills without a dog to warn off large predators.

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364794 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Plan is missing giving appropriate weight to the benefits of dog walking on humans. Those benefits are stated in the report, but nowhere is there a calculation of the benefit thereof in weighing the four alternatives.

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5971 **Comment Id:** 364834 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Voice Control be maintained because diminution of leash aggression can add substantially to the effectiveness of any good dog management plan. Poor use of leads on frustrated dogs is a trigger to conflict. A trained and well-maintained dog allowed to make, and be rewarded for proper behavior is a permanent solution to many of the objections raised by proponents of the 'anti-dog' mindset. This assumes an aware, educated, responsible and cooperative dog-owning population. The dog community has some distance to travel before attaining this status.

Organization:

Commenter: Garril Page **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6014 **Comment Id:** 364959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having room to run without being on leash is important for the health of our dogs. It's also good for the health of humans because it usually involves much more walking on the part of people than going to the small areas designated as off leash. Being able to play off leash is not only important for the physical health of dogs, but also their mental health as well.

The same for the people who walk them, live with them.

Organization:

Commenter: Cecil Myers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6018 **Comment Id:** 364963 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My wife packs up the dogs for a day trip or a weekend and we enjoy our time together walking at Crissy Field or on one of the beaches where dogs are allowed off-leash. This is essential for our physical and spiritual well-being, and I know the same is true for many people, dog owners or otherwise.

Organization: "taxpayer and voter"

Commenter: Chuck Humpal **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6019 **Comment Id:** 364965 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the new altered restrictions for off leash restrictions at Fort Funston and Crissy Field. I walk my Golden retriever daily at Fort Funston for the sake of his need to exercise and socialize- -as well as mine! I meet people of all walks of life and socio-economic levels and I see the extremely important benefit of the social interaction that a place like Fort Funston provides

Organization:

Commenter: Mary M Guerra **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6022 **Comment Id:** 364971 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Open space for responsible dog owners and their pets is critical to health and well-being. While I am only 67, the fresh air and socializing (with others and with my Boston Terrier, Georgie) is critical to my mental health (as in keeping me from isolation).

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Sanders **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6023 **Comment Id:** 364972 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Open parks for dogs are important for not just the dogs but their owners as well. They are important for happy healthy socialized dogs

Organization:

Commenter: Ric West **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6028 **Comment Id:** 364996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Francisco is a dense, urban environment (as is the entire Bay Area). Dog owners need open spaces to recreate with our dogs for our own health and the health of our animal companions. San Francisco has more dogs than children, and certainly dog owners have just as much need for healthy recreation as families with kids, not to mention families with kids and dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Rhodes Klement **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6058 **Comment Id:** 365278 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my experience, people who do not have good voice control over their dogs to to parks with fences, such as Lafayette Park, near our home. There have been incidents there of people bringing out of control dogs to these areas because they feel there is a safety mechanism in place. This is dangerous for other pets, their owners, and especially children.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah L Stern **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6058 **Comment Id:** 365279 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We must have areas that are off leash for people to take their dogs, under strong voice control at all times, for the health, safety and vitality of our community.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah L Stern **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6084 **Comment Id:** 365381 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: From another angle, dogs off-leash are dangerous to the public. When one goes to enjoy a public park one should not have to be worried about being harassed, nipped or bitten by dogs running free. Dogs should be allowed to run free only in those public park areas that are fenced and well labeled for dogs to run free.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Malbon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4483 **Comment Id:** 365384 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In most cases the arguments consist of statements made as if representing fact, but without any clear supporting evidence. To me, the biggest example is the section that argues that the 95 dog bites recorded over a 4 year period proves that a change in policy is needed. On its own, 95 dog bites in 4 years sounds like a lot, but the report presents no data on the occurrence of dog bites in other parks with a different policy, and with a comparable number of visitors and dogs.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6305 **Comment Id:** 365458 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: 7. People who walk dogs are in better physical shape than other people (new study out of England). They are less of an expense on our health care system. We should be encouraging this! 8. Dogs not only get people out exercising, they are companions for families and for seniors. Many seniors walk their dogs on and off leash. Their dogs get them out and give them an opportunity to be social. Why are we regulating mans best friend when they provide so much benefit to citizens of all ages.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa P Carey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6145 **Comment Id:** 365613 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I could go on about the finer points about what I disagree with your plan. But first I have to tell you about how walking my dogs at Fort Funston has saved my sanity. My building burned on January 23, 2014. The Wag Hotel has been taking care of my dogs. Every morning I pick them up and go for an hour or more walk at Fort Funston. I than go to clean up my house. Fort Funston has saved my sanity once again.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia J LaCava **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6166 **Comment Id:** 365693 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: So many people depend on their dogs as companions (especially the elderly), as a reason for getting exercise, and for protection.
Organization:
Commenter: Morton J Stein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6360 **Comment Id:** 365801 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: A key piece of evidence cited throughout the report is the data showing 95 dog-attack incidents in the GGNRA from 2008 to 2011. This is cited as an argument in favor of a change in the dog management policy, because it seems to reflect an unacceptable number of such dog bites and attacks. However, the more I think about this, the less convinced I am that this data indicates a truly unacceptable problem.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6204 **Comment Id:** 366007 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many older people now avoid parks and the GGNRA because of all of the dogs, mostly off leash. Even on-leash dogs can jump on a person, especially when they are walked on the long expandable leashes. I think that you need to specify a maximum leash length of 6 feet. I get tired of having leashes wrap around my legs and that entrapment is also dangerous.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366028 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Moreover, GGAS' members have repeated informed us about negative interactions with dogs and dog owners in parts of the GGNRA, typically because an off-leash dog has charged one of our members (on occasion, resulting in a bite) or charged wildlife. Members report avoiding areas they once visited, including Ft. Funston (once a great spot for birding), and Ocean Beach (one member stated she will no longer take her grandchildren there for fear of off-leash dogs and the presence of dog feces in the sand). Our members' experiences are borne out in the hundreds of Criminal Incident Reports that were cited in our May 2011 letter (attached hereto and incorporated by reference).

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6396 **Comment Id:** 366089 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs can introduce a variety of illnesses and diseases into nature. These include: canine distemper, rabies, parvovirus, plague, giardia, muscle cysts, and leptospirosis. They also transport ticks, keds, tapeworms and fleas. Dogs can bite or attack other hikers. This opens the NPS up for liability. Dogs can be bitten by rattlesnakes or other wildlife. Dogs are best left out of wilderness areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Jacqueline A Steuer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6218 **Comment Id:** 366135 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I used to farm and land scape and have a bad back and easily sore arms from working on a computer constantly and my only joy of every day is walking and running my dog off leash, giving us both a great exercise. It is nearly impossible to run with a dog for they need to consistently stop and smell for enjoyment and to catch their breath... running with him off leash allows him to take a break and go to the bathroom and for me to keep on running as well

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6230 **Comment Id:** 366150 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a resident of San Francisco and have been going to Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and Baker Beach on a weekly basis for the last 10 years because I can walk my dog off leash there. Being able to do this improves the quality of my life and my health and gives me great joy.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6261 **Comment Id:** 366316 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog walking and dog play are more than just healthy human recreation. Dog walking and dog play are a daily, bona fide need for families that include dogs as family members. Many responded to pleas by organizations like San Francisco's world-famous SPCA to adopt dogs. As responsible animal and nature lovers, we will fulfill our commitment to care for our recreational needs and the needs of our canine companions one way or another.
Organization: Dogpatch Dogs
Commenter: Carma J Keats **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6287 **Comment Id:** 366425 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs (and owners) in the other highly urban, only leashed dog environments, yields more neurotic behavior including fighting, biting, social inappropriateness and other behaviors not normally seen when dogs are allowed to run around; running around naturally occurring trees, hills, up and down dunes, running into the water, etc. These are happy dogs. They support happy owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Seth Feigenbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6298 **Comment Id:** 366472 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog and I both need the type of exercise you can only get from off-leash running!
Organization:
Commenter: Tracey N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6616 **Comment Id:** 367221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sometimes dogs protect their owner to keep them safe.
Organization:
Commenter: Michaella Ravelo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6617 **Comment Id:** 367224 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe.
Organization:
Commenter: Rafael na **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6518 **Comment Id:** 367649 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Safety issues concerning dogs: The data sited by the SEIS of dog incidents does not justify the need for off-leash restrictions. The number of dog bites or attacks (95) from 2008 - 2011 is tiny compared to the millions of dog visits over the GGNRA 80,000 acres. The latest compilation of incidents for 2013: 6 dog bites, 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints from people who were frightened, 1 wildlife killing and one horse bitten. So incidents have gone down in spite of the increase of human population and by inference dog population.
Organization:
Commenter: Nancy Stafford **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367979 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The importance of recreation has not lessened in the intervening years. Rather, it has increased. From the White House to local initiatives, improving health and fitness is a high priority in an increasingly obese and unfit population. The National Park Service itself has introduced the Healthy Parks, Healthy People program, which was the subject of a well-publicized conference in the GGNRA in April, 2011. Thus, the GGNRA should be and could be in the forefront of one of the most important initiatives to improve health in a national context, by highlighting and showcasing people exercising with their dogs in the GGNRA. The people walking dogs in the GGNRA are engaging in a form of exercise now recognized as a compelling and effective route to better health. Research has shown that walking with a dog is likely to result in lengthier and more frequent walks than walking with another person or with a group (See, e.g., Marcus, 2008; and Brown and Rhodes, 2006.)(3). The health benefits of walking with ones dog in the GGNRA, widely noted by those who visit with their dogs, and those who come to see and walk with the dogs, are ignored by the Dog Management Plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367988 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Walking off-leash provides additional physical safety. It is also a safe place for the dogs to walk, because they have the space to meet or to avoid each other. And there is no issue of leash aggression because the dogs are off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368094 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We exercise in these areas with our dog off leash and under voice control for both our own health as well as the health of our dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6646 **Comment Id:** 368210 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is also important to me that my wife and children have a safe place to go when I am traveling. The presence of other dog owners and professional dog walkers adds a critical element of safety to these areas. People walking their dogs are alert to things that do not look right and are always quick to help others at the park. Further, when my elder parents visit they enjoy walking with us and our dog, on and off leash. Access to these areas is critical for a safe walk.

Organization:

Commenter: Les Nagy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6652 **Comment Id:** 368242 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I want dogs to be free! There is no proof that dogs are causing damage. Dogs need exercise and if they are cooped up all the time it is possible that they could incessantly might misbehave. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe and not all dog owners are irresponsible

Organization:

Commenter: Jada N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6654 **Comment Id:** 368245 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Even family pets off leash are often intimidating to small children and even mature adults whose balance is still good, but could be easily knocked down by an over eager dog running into them or near them. And any large dog running freely is intimidating to those who do not feel comfortable around large animals.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Jolliffe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6656 **Comment Id:** 368249 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our dog Sam is a gentle black lab who loves to swim and play ball. He needs his exercise to stay healthy. Coincidentally, this regular exercise keeps me fit and healthy as well.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan M Kaplan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368386 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Public parks shared by running children and off-leash dogs are potentially unsafe for children (Kahn et al 2003 & De Keuster et al. 2006). Although in theory, it may be possible to somewhat reduce the risk to children exposed to off-leash dogs (Love & Overall 2001), in reality: Any dog is capable of biting, including those with no history of biting and those whose aggressive behavior has been treated, regardless of whether the dog has received obedience training (Reisner et al. 2007, Reisner 2003, Rohrich & Reagan 1999, referenced by Reisner & Shofer 2008, the source of the quotation). NPS must intervene to perform a risk analysis and protect visitors by segregating off-leash activity and explicitly warning visitors about the risks of entering areas where off-leash dogs are allowed.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368392 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Complications of dog bites include cosmetic problems, pain, infection, and emotional consequences such as posttraumatic stress disorder. Dog bites are expensive, in terms of emergency, medical and surgical care, vaccinations and the physical and emotional consequences on children and families (Reisner 2013). As noted below under Comparison of Dog Management Policies & Regulations/Risk Assessment, a high proportion of owners of attacking dogs in GGNRA either abscond without providing contact information to the victim or provide bogus contact information, suggesting that in many cases attack victims could not recover payments necessary for medical and psychological treatment associated with injuries.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368431 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I reviewed FOIA data obtained by the Center for Biological Diversity in 2004, including law enforcement data from GGNRA and from National Parks nationwide. My impression was that the number of serious dog-related incidents in GGNRA documented was in the same ball park if not greater than all incidents from the rest of the U.S. National Parks

combined. The EIS should refer to dog incident data from other Parks in performing a risk assessment of off-leash dog activity and discuss this in the EIS to provide some context for the dog incident data from GGNRA presented in the SEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 2532 **Comment Id:** 368679 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The value of spending time with one's best friend off leash in nature without breaking any laws is crucial to human and canine health and wellness. I am a psychotherapist by trade and can testify to the power of both animal assisted therapy and nature's positive impact on those who suffer.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4506 **Comment Id:** 368681 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Walking my dog improves both my dog's and my physical and mental health. My dog is an SF SPCA certified Animal Assisted Therapy dog. Exercise is an important part of her daily routine, both walking with me and occasionally with her dog walker. Access to the GGNRA for this highly social activity is an important aspect of the quality of life in San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: kathryn Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6544 **Comment Id:** 368700 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It improves my mental health, physical health, commitment to my community and motivation to think forward of our shared responsibility to make it as available and pristine as it is for us now. I really seek ways that my disabled clients can better reap those benefits with improved access and outreach efforts. It is immeasurable how the GGNRA sites aid and support me, my family, and the city as a whole.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary-Lynn Garrett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6549 **Comment Id:** 368702 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'am writing because Dogs and Dog Walkers Keep parks safe and all dogs need to get exercise if they don't the dogs might misbehave.

Organization:

Commenter: Maurice Ali **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4287 **Comment Id:** 368817 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: So if you have no sound scientific data to support the environmental reason to restrict areas to dogs lets look at the safety issue. Well in this case your data is overwhelming in pointing to what are the causes of serious safety incidents - 98% DD NOT INVOLVE DOGS. The problem is people, not dogs. Only 2% ivolve dogs. This alone should really force you to re-think the whole reason for the DEIS.
Organization:
Commenter: Alex Norton **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6659 **Comment Id:** 369500 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Not all dog owners are irresponsible. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe.
Organization:
Commenter: Irianna Morales **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

HS4000 Health and Safety: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives (Substantive)

1. **Commenters are concerned about the repercussions of limiting the areas where off leash dogs are allowed. When dogs are forced into smaller spaces, especially fenced-in spaces, stress levels can increase due to confinement. Commenters feel that this could lead to a dog population in San Francisco that is less social, less exercised, and more aggressive, ultimately leading to more incidents between dogs and between dogs and people. Additionally, restricting dog owners to smaller spaces will degrade these areas and other community parks and would worsen the park experience for dog owners.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1007 **Comment Id:** 351414 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not adequately address the environmental and social impact of forcing large numbers of people and dogs into much smaller areas. Reducing the amount of area available for off-leash will significantly degrade the park experience for people with dogs. It will increase conflicts

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2195 **Comment Id:** 353200 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I urge you to consider the long-term impacts of dramatically raising the activation energy of hundreds of families and individuals in the city in order to get them to go outside with their dogs. Increased traffic congestion, number of cars in the city, and a less fit, obese population are all obvious long term side effects of this excessive and poorly thought out plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Melissa Severini **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4788 **Comment Id:** 361533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. The need for open space areas for dogs is important not only for the health of the dog, but to maintain adequate space between dogs. Limiting this open space will therefore result in overcrowding of dogs in the dog parks - leading to unfortunate situations of more aggression and a less relaxed atmosphere.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Kattula **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5511 **Comment Id:** 363889 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Not to mention that dog outnumber children in San Francisco, the GGNRA is proposing that the other 90% o people essentially "stack" their dogs on top of one another at the specific parks that sanction. This will create FAR MORE PROBLEMS in the community. As a professional dog walker and business owner since 2005, the negative ramifications far outnumber the reasons to pass along their plan. The analogy can be made for people as it is for dogs, the less "space" in a park, the more agitated people and or dogs may become. Dogs do not have the same reasoning and decision making we do, and therefore dogs will become more territorial and dog fights will become epidemic. Not only dog fighting, and barking creating constant noise problems for local residents, but all fights may lead to humans be injured.
Organization: SuperDog City, LLC
Commenter: Corey M Vitale **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters believe that off leash dogs should be separated from other visitors, especially children and the elderly. Commenters are concerned about dogs under voice control not being responsive to their owners or walkers around other park visitors. Several commenters were specifically concerned about the off leash area proposed near the Farallone Elementary School.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5 **Comment Id:** 337956 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I would like to voice my support for Crissy Field maps 10f and 10c. These two maps achieve two important objectives: 1. It leaves a large area where dogs can run around off leash (ROLA) on both the field AND a long stretch of beach. Dog walkers should be able to enjoy sizable areas of the beach and field as ROLA. 2. It preserves East Beach for a place for young children and families free of dogs. East Beach is the most used area of Crissy field. My own daughter was run over and left with a bloody nose by a dog chasing a ball. Her twin sister had stepped in dog feces that same trip. The fact is that part of the beach is too heavily impacted as it is. Removing the dogs and creating a safe stretch of beach free of dogs is a fair thing to do for families.
Organization:
Commenter: Philip M Brady **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 70 **Comment Id:** 338959 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I very strongly oppose Alternative C. Frankly, I am shocked to see that an "off-leash" dog park is being proposed for the area between Tamarind and Le Conte streets. As noted in the plan, this area is right across the street from an elementary school!!! It would be quite dangerous for small school children to encounter off-leash dogs just across the street from their play ground! As voice control is ineffective for most dogs, there would be a high risk of injury to

children. In addition, there are homes along Tamarind Street that would now have an "off-leash" dog park, literally in their front yard!! Again, this seems untenable in terms of potential dog attacks to the people who live on this street. (I live on this street!). Also, it seems highly likely that off-leash dogs would easily run into and damage the yards of these homes and the grounds of the Farallone View Elementary School.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Madsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 359 **Comment Id:** 351133 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: am writing to you in much distress because of the ongoing dog situation at Crissy Field. Let the dogs have some portion of the field or designate some more remote park for their use. Crissy Field is a heavily used Park and it is insane and unsafe to allow the current situation to continue.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary Faust **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 724 **Comment Id:** 353051 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to report that I was running on Ocean Beach this morning (at around 45th Ave). A dog, off leash, came up from behind me and jumped on my back. His owner was about a quarter of a block away. Frightened, it was a medium to large sized dog, I started screaming for her to get her dog away from me - the dog was continuing to jump on me and was growling. I turned my back to the dog and remained still(although I kept yelling at the lady to get her dog), as this is not the first time this has happened to me on this stretch of the beach, and experience has taught me not to continue running, to remain still and to turn my back to the dog. The owner proceeded to lash out at me - asking me why I was being so nasty while her dog continued to jump on my back and growl at me! Several unpleasant"French" words were exchanged, but the upshot was that she felt it was my fault. Luckily, I was not harmed, but just shaken up a bit by this encounter and certainly by her response. Human nature baffles me as her dog clearly ran after me and assaulted me on an area of Ocean Beach in which dogs are to be kept on leashes. Then to add insult to injury, the owner of the dog attributes the problem to be me! It's quite laughable, really. As I said this is not the first time this has happened to me, but I am certainly not going to stop running on the beach and so I hope that a dog plan will be put in place and enforced that will allow dogs the freedom to run off leash in certain areas while affording that same freedom to humans so that they can run unharmed.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Several commenters are concerned about the leash requirements in certain areas that they see as unsafe for leashed dogs, such as Big Beach at Muir Beach and the sand ladder of Fort Funston. Commenters state that leashes in these areas could endanger the walkers who**

must control the dogs in unstable settings or could possibly strand the dogs and owners during high tide.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 369 **Comment Id:** 351273 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In the NPS's "preferred alternative" for Muir Beach, leashes would be required on Big Beach. The NPS's justification for the workability of such a change is that Little Beach is there for all who want to let their dogs run. From a safety standpoint, we are concerned that visitors will cross over to access Little Beach and become stranded during high tides, then try to unsafely cross over the rocks to get back to "Big Beach", creating more incidents for our emergency services.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Wynn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3930 **Comment Id:** 360075 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For example insisting to have dogs on leash on the steep slopes of Funston, including the southern sand stairs. This will be extremely dangerous for the feeble, the elderly and any one else who finds traversing such terrain difficult-even without being jerked around by a dog who traverses the stairway with four feet instead of two. Adding a LEASHED dog in such an environment is not only extremely dangerous, it lacks common sense, Falling down stairs as a result of being jerked from a dog on a leash is not only dangerous to the dog owner but to other people on the sand stairs. A stairway that often is overcrowded with families including small children.

Organization:

Commenter: Fred A Andrews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. **Off leash dogs are a considerable concern for many commenters who expressed the desire to have dogs leashed in all areas of the park or banned entirely. Commenters are unhappy about unruly dog behavior, dog waste and bags, hostile dog owners, and disturbances to wildlife and habitat.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 192 **Comment Id:** 350075 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a resident of the Homestead Valley area of Mill Valley for over 17 years. I leave next to the Homestead Fire Rd as drawn on MAP 3. I use the fire road on a weekly basis and STRONGLY BELIEVE THE DOGS NEED TO BE ON LEASH OR BANNED ALTOGETHER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: 1. I have been bitten by a dog. The dog was not on a leash or under voice control. 2. Dog walkers routinely walk 4 dogs who are rarely on leash. I see these dogs run wild disturbing hikers, families, bike riders, local wildlife (Rabbits,birds, etc.), digging/crush native vegetation, and defecating on the trail. 3. I routinely see "plastic poop bags" on the trail unclaimed - unsightly and unsanitary. 4. I have seen dog on dog clashes. I get concerned the dogs may then turn on a human - adult or child

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 508 **Comment Id:** 351836 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: This comment is for the Homestead Fire Road in Homestead Valley. I support Preferred Alternative F - Dogs on Leash because: 1. I am a resident of the area and use the trail frequently. I have been bitten by a dog on this trail and fear for my safety every time I see a dog on the trail. I have frequently been approached by barking/growling dogs not on-leash or under voice control. 2. Commercial dog walkers use this trail and typically have 3-6 dogs not on leash and not under voice control (dogs running loose and bothering people (other animals/vegetation). I have also been harassed by commercial dog walkers who feel they have control of the space and can do what ever they want.
Organization:
Commenter: unkown unknown **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6474 **Comment Id:** 368829 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Off-leash dogs can be a serious safety risk and are a huge disturbance to the increasingly smaller numbers of wildlife that remain in the GGNRA. There is no easy way to balance human pets and wildlife in the GGNRA, but the scientific evidence presented by the National Park Service and independent experts clearly point to the conclusion that dogs must be on leash or excluded from any GGNRA area where endangered and threatened wildlife and their habitat, plus native plants, have been documented.
Organization:
Commenter: Celeste Langille **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

5. Many commenters, especially senior citizens and disabled people are unable to exercise their dogs appropriately on leash. Reducing off leash areas would limit the areas where senior citizens and disabled people can exercise with their dogs.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 155 **Comment Id:** 349884 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The elimination of major portions of National Park services for off leash dogs, particularly Crissy Field and Fort Funston, severely hampers my ability to keep fit as a senior citizen. Recreation is not about watching my dog run in a small enclosed area. I am 69 years old and walk vigorously at fort funston and crissy field along with my 22 lb schnauzer sally off leash. I can not put her on leash as it throws me off balance. Your new proposal virtually eliminates my ability to recreate and will make me go to local san francisco parks to get my workout. This is unfair to san francisco as we gave the land to you for fort funston and against my health interests as a senior citizen.
Organization:
Commenter: cheryl e traverse **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 238 **Comment Id:** 350168 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: For many urban dog guardians, especially seniors who find it difficult exercise their pets while on-leash, the GGNRA represents the only place where they can allow their dogs to play, romp around and release a lot of energy. Take away this haven for exercise, and guardians may be unable to meet the physical needs of their pets. Daily exercise, like food and water, is essential to a dog's proper health and well-being.

Organization:

Commenter: chris benson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 873 **Comment Id:** 353482 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a disabled person with a companion dog, I really value the ability I have to take my dog to places like Chrissy Field and Fort Funston where he can run off leash. I have Spina Bifida and use leg braces and a cane, as a result it is very difficult for me to walk my dog on leash. The loss of access to such places would be a great blow to both of us, and severely limit our options for outdoor recreation in the city. I find it very hard to use the existing enclosed dog parks in the city, as the dogs there tend to be very territorial and aggressive. In the past I have been knocked over by these animals, and so I am forced to sit on a bench. My dog is protective and will then sit beside me and thus not take advantage of being off-leash. This is not a problem that occurs at more open spaces such as Chrissy Field and Fort Funston, where I am able to walk more freely and he can accompany me.

Organization:

Commenter: Charles J Whelon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

6. **Commenters noted the constant presence of dogs and dog walkers as an enhanced safety measure. Many commenters feel safer when walking with their dogs, as the dogs provide protection from wildlife and potentially ill-intentioned people. Prohibiting dogs on trails may exclude people, especially women, from recreating in these areas because they do not feel safe on the trails by themselves.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 247 **Comment Id:** 350347 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I do not own a dog, I have never owned one. But I can remember when these areas were unsafe for women, Ft Funston at any time. It was the dog walkers who came and took back this park area from the bums and drug dealers, not the GGNRA police or park rangers. It has been the dog walkers who have kept this a safe place for me to walk. There is so much space in the GGNRA - I ask that you do the right thing and give the off leash dog walkers more land. There are more dogs than children in San Francisco. For many people these dogs are their family who keep them active and therefore mentally and physically healthy. Ideally, all GGNRA would be dog friendly. If you can allow guns and ATVs in Federal parks, dogs should be able to walk off leash.

Organization:
Commenter: Barbara Fugate **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1429 **Comment Id:** 352535 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a woman who frequently hikes alone during the week, many times, the only other people I see on the trails are other folks walking their dogs. When you take that user group out of the mix, it feels LESS SAFE. This was the case when many former off leash sites in SF became leash only. Suddenly, no one was there. The regular folk disappeared who'd been daily walkers.
Organization:
Commenter: Kim Wonderley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4081 **Comment Id:** 353606 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: It is also worth noting that parks that allow off-leash recreating make those parks safer for everyone. People with dogs visit these parks rain-or-shine, day-or-night, because dogs always need to be exercised. That means there's always someone in the parks and solo people out for walks or jogs are safer for it, because they aren't alone.
Organization:
Commenter: Kristy Brady **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361119 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The other safety argument is that women, in particular, feel safer when with a dog. I would not feel comfortable hiking on any trail alone without my canine companion for protection. By banning dogs on many of our trails here in Marin, you are virtually cutting off access to women, many of whom would stop using the trails if they couldnt bring their dog.
Organization:
Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

7. **Commenters state that the need to exercise their dogs in turn forces them to exercise, resulting in better health for both dog and person. In a crowded city such as San Francisco, dogs needs areas to exercise in order to release pent up energy. Commenters fear that restricting dogs to on leash exercise or smaller off leash areas will result in stressed dogs that will act out in non-safe ways, increasing dog-related incidents at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Commenters fear that a more restrictive area where dogs are permitted would cause a decline in their own health, as well as that of their dogs. In addition, dog owners and dog walkers feel a sense of community with others they meet on regular visits to exercise their dogs. Several commenters who do not own dogs relate that watching dogs run on the beaches is part of the enjoyment of California parks.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 176 **Comment Id:** 349987 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I greatly value that San Francisco has many official off leash areas for dogs. Dogs are an important part of our society, they provide companionship, stress relief and an easy icebreaker for people in a community to start interacting. Dogs need exercise to be well behaved, happy members of the community. My dog loves to run in the offleash areas, and would not be able to get adequate exercise if he were only allowed on leash. We monitor him closely to make sure he does not disturb other people enjoying the area. Please reconsider the proposed restrictions on offleash areas. The current rules have worked well since the 70s, please do not reduce our access to allow our dog and their owners (us!) healthy and happy lives.

Organization: ngmoco:)

Commenter: Amber Morey-Wu **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2104 **Comment Id:** 355701 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Everyday I see, firsthand, the power of the human-dog relationship, and it is difficult to see how that relationship can truly be fostered when the dog is inhibited from free play. Free, off-leash play in an outdoors environment offers an opportunity to build trust and discipline that would not be as available should this restrictive alternative be implemented. Many of my patients leave their homes for the sole purpose of taking their dogs to one of these amazing off-leash areas and would otherwise stay at home, missing out on much-needed exercise, social interaction, and sun. Running in an open environment is also pertinent to the health of these urban animals, especially larger dogs, who were often bred to perform rigorous physical activity and to freely roam farmlands.

Organization: UCSF

Commenter: Christopher Stauffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3193 **Comment Id:** 357962 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am not a dog owner, but I think that limiting dog walking to leash-only on trails and beaches in Marin would significantly decrease quality of life in Marin. I hike extensively in Marin and I've never had an issue with off-leash dogs. To my mind, seeing dogs run off-leash on the beach is one of the great things about California, and I would be sad to see this freedom limited.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura T Landman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2366 **Comment Id:** 358399 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs aid in the health and well being of all their owners, both young and old, providing exercise and companionship. They are the lifeline for many elderly people. Dog owners are not asking for anything more ..... we just want to keep what we have allowing us to

utilize trails and beaches designated for dogs lovers, some allowing our dogs to play freely off leash and get the much needed exercise they also need.

Organization:

Commenter: Diane Barrett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3930 **Comment Id:** 360056 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This is not good for me because I suffer from depression. I am veteran of the armed forces and find great comfort running with my dog, indeed my doctor insists that I continue to run and that my companionship with my dog is healthy and should be maintained. Not allowing me to recreate with my dog directly affects my well-being in a negative way.

Organization:

Commenter: Fred A Andrews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

8. Commenters do not believe that the data presented in the SEIS regarding the health impacts from dog-related incidents and dog waste are not representative of the actual conditions at Golden Gate National Recreation Area; commenters feel that the adverse impacts are inflated, as the data are not relevant to the actual conditions. Other commenters are concerned about the health impacts from pet waste that is not disposed of properly. Additionally, one commenter suggested performing a risk assessment to determine the impacts off leash dogs have on the health and safety of other visitors.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 663 **Comment Id:** 352857 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Lastly, health is a concern (Foster 2006). Fecal and urine waste can carry pathogens (bacterial, viral, parasitic) that may affect visitors and other animals. The leading cause of illness is from contaminated water. Exposure to contaminated water from dog waste can result in fever, nausea, gastroenteritis as well as flu-like symptoms. It is well documented that areas with unmanaged and unleashed dogs show a poorer water quality than areas with strong leash laws. A state law already prohibits dogs on public swimming beaches for health reasons. A stricter policy will keep recreational areas even cleaner. Feral cats and cat colonies are also mentioned. The largest concern is feral cat and bird interactions (Winter; Wallace 2006). However, the plan does not go into detail about what can be done to ensure nonissues with cats nor discuss further into cat colonies. Cat colonies should be kept clean for health reasons as well as the spread of rodents that can carry disease (mice species have been found feeding on food the cats do not eat) and insect pests (such as cockroaches) (Winter; Wallace 2006). Unmanaged and uncontrolled animals should be taken care of by animal control or park management accordingly

Organization:

Commenter: Faith Wall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4224 **Comment Id:** 362231 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The report suggests on page 14 that "... An increase in nutrients from dog

excrement in concentrated areas could result in some areas becoming overfertilized and lead to changes in plant species and distribution as well as changes in soil organisms." Also, on page 20 "the overwhelming smell of urine in park areas with heavy dog use (e.g., Fort Funston) may also affect visitor experience at the park." The common consensus is that dog excrement at Fort Funston is in general effectively managed with significant public participation. Perhaps the reported smell is coming from the poorly maintained human toilet facilities managed by GGNRA. From page 22 "A health concern associated with dog waste is pathogens that can infect humans if ingested." No data provided to support this as an issue. Literature is cited without any investigation of the actual conditions at the sites. Again, the issue of public trust when the efforts of so many volunteers helping to clean the park are ignored.

Organization:

Commenter: G K Webb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368404 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS seems to have completely avoided explicit discussion of risk assessment of off-leash dog activity that other entities have performed in relation to their determinations about how to manage the risk of off-leash dog activity. The EIS should explicitly provide a risk assessment of off-leash dog activities in GGNRA and use such an assessment to determine how the risks can be eliminated. Where those risks cannot be eliminated, such as many parks have concluded cannot be done, then GGNRA should be explicit about which visitors and/or user groups cannot safety interact with off leash dogs without risk to their visitor experience or safety.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368788 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SEIS, page 375, argues that dog waste and dog urine affect soils. As usual, SEIS offers no scientific citations. It cites NPS 1999, which is Natural Resources Section, Resources Management Plan, Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Prepared by Golden Gate National Recreation Area. December 1999. Thats useless on many counts: 1) Its not a scientific document, 2) Its GGNRA citing itself, 3) Its a citation to a huge document, with no page number, so no one can check the citation. SEIS presents, in lieu of evidence, only the usual can, could, and very many mays. GGNRA made the dog waste harms soils claim long ago, during Negotiated Rulemaking. In the Technical Subcommittee, GGNRA was asked for evidence to support their claim. The request was repeated at subsequent Technical Subcommittee meetings. No evidence was ever produced. In comment on the DEIS I pointed out the DEIS still offered no evidence, even though the DEIS repeated the claim. Now we are at SEIS. The claim is still made; there is still no evidence. Really, after three strikes, you are out (and should withdraw the claim).

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369656 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE SEIS DOES NOT ADEQUATELY ANALYZE HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES The SEIS, like the DEIS, does not provide an honest evaluation of impacts of dogs on human health and safety. This is particularly true in the SEIS discussion of dog bites. On p. 35, the SEIS says: Data collected by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention show that approximately 4.5 million Americans are bitten by dogs each year, and one in five dog bites results in injuries that require medical attention. This statement is repeated on p. 336, followed by additional information that: Small children are typically the most common victims of dog-related injuries because of their natural behaviors, such as running, yelling, grabbing, and hitting, which may threaten a dog. ... Elderly people are also considered at a higher risk of complications from dog-related injuries due to their increased susceptibility to bruising, lacerations, or broken/dislocated bones. On p. 1228, the SEIS adds to this expanded description of dog injuries that: In general, children are the most common victims of serious dog bites in the United States, with 70 percent of fatal dog attacks and more than half of serious bite wounds involving children... This is followed by an anecdotal quote from a DEIS comment from a parent whose small children were frightened by off-leash dogs. The perception created by these statistics, and in particular the way they are presented, is that dogs in the GGNRA present a significant health risk for people, especially children and seniors. Children are likely to be seriously bitten and even killed by off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. The problem is that the SETS presents only part of the story. The reality is that few dog bites happen in park settings like the GGNRA. In one of the most comprehensive analyses of injuries due to dog bites, Canadian researchers searched a national database of all reports of injuries throughout Canada in 1996 (Canadian Hospitals Injury Reporting and Prevention Program, or CHIRPP; the study can be found at: http://www.phac-aspc.gc .calinjury-bles/chirpp/injrep rapbles/dogbit-eng.php). Dog bites represented 1% of all injuries in the CHTRPP database.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369660 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: So what about the second claim that conflicts between users have begun to rise? The SEIS offers no specific evidence to support this claim. However, it does discuss the total number of dog-related incidents, which is all we have available to consider. Table 5: Number and Types of Incident Reports Within GGNRA, 2001 -2011, on p. 253 of the SETS shows a total of 4,932 dog-related incidents, out of total number of incidents reported of 45,700; that is, dog-related incidents make up 11 of the total number of incidents. The non-dog-related incidents range from Drug Offences, to Trespassing, with nearly one-third listed as Other. Other clearly includes most violent crime in the GGNRA, from murder, to rape, to robbery, but the SEIS does not provide any information on how common such violent crime - the true safety risk for park visitors - is in the GGNRA. The first thing to notice is that the percentage of total incidents that are dog related hovers around ii % throughout the ten year period (ranging from a low of 6% 006 to a high of 14% in 2004). This table does not show any significant increase in incidents, and by extension, in conflicts over the last ten years. Theres no indication in this data that there have been increasing problems with dogs over at least the last ten years. This

contradicts the SETS stated reason on p. 6 for a new Dog Management Plan. A closer look at the data presented in Tables 11 through 28 (pp. 313 - 328) listing the number and type of dog-related incidents at various GGNRA sites shows that the vast majority of incidents at each site were for leash violations or merely being in an closed area, without any wildlife disturbance or resource degradation. Clearly, there is no safety crisis or wildlife disturbance crisis or resource degradation crisis caused by dogs in the GGNRA.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 3 **Comment Id:** 337953 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Eliminating areas where dogs (under voice control) are able to run freely with make those few parks in San Francisco with off leash areas more crowded than they already are. It will negatively impact the health and welfare of dogs and their owners. It will increase pollution by forcing people to drive further to reach an off leash area.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel M Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 337963 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My comment is on dog use plans for Mori Point. If all dog owners were walking docile pets, then perhaps this would not be important. However, some dogs are excitable and may behave in ways that are upsetting or frightening to human users, particularly cyclists or those with small children. Most dog owners will self-police, and choose the higher-ground bypass trails if they know their dogs tend to bark at children or lunge at other dogs or cyclists. There are other possibilities that could further protect and preserve use for everyone. For example, there is no need for dogs to be allowed on Bootleggers Steps (dogs don't need stairs) - - but you don't have any proposed maps that appear to differentiate between areas designed for the comfort of humans and areas likely to be popular among dog walkers.

Organization:

Commenter: Abigail R Marshall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 16 **Comment Id:** 337973 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a 32 year resident of the Sunset District of SF and a dog owner who has used Fort Funston as a uniquely wonderful site to walk my dog for years, I must register my extreme disappointment at the proposals put forth by the NPS. Walking a dog off leash is one of the pinnacles of the dog ownership experience. It allows the dog to "be a dog". It allows the owner to get outdoors and walk in a pleasant environment with the companionship of their pet and to experience the pleasure of seeing their pet happy, free, socializing with other dogs, and getting real, unfettered exercise. Walking a dog on a leash is a mere shadow of the experience of walking a dog off leash and leashed walking should in no way be seen as an equivalent to off leash walking.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 29 **Comment Id:** 337989 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog park near Farallone Elementary School. PLEASE NO. Please see below my letter to the Farallone View Elemenrty and San Mateo County Sheriff. It will only make the

GGNRA160211

current issues of crime on campus worse. Use the precautionary principle and leave the off-leash dog group to find an area far away from children.

Organization:

Commenter: Brenda Donald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 35 **Comment Id:** 337998 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The sand ladder at fort funston is an unstable and dangerous trail. Introducing leashes would increase the risk of injury to people and dogs alike.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert D Ellison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 73 **Comment Id:** 338962 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We would prefer a complete ban. However, barring that, the preferred park solution (21F) would be our second choice. We feel that the organized off leash dog groups have enjoyed a louder voice due to their organized numbers, drowning out individual comments like ours. Our personal safety has been put at risk by off leash dogs on more than a few occasions and the owners quickly flee, leaving us no way to put on record such incidents. This leaves the off leash support groups the freedom to claim that there are few, if any, such incidents. We are seniors and as we age, feel less able to fend off, and thus fear these aggressive dogs and their belligerent owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Charles Parker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 27 **Comment Id:** 343277 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are plenty of places in San Francisco that people can enjoy dog free. We need to keep the spaces that are now available for people with dogs. It is well established that having dogs, and being able to exercise them, is vital for the health of many people, particularly older adults, for whom dog walking is one of the most effective and safe forms of exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Milman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 109 **Comment Id:** 343887 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Studies have shown that owning a dog can add 5-7 years to human lifespan. In our sedentary and obese society dog ownership must be strongly encouraged and enabled. We demand open space to exist and run. Wilderness and nature belong to all humans and animals.

Organization: Pythom Inc

Commenter: Tina O Sjogren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 122 **Comment Id:** 346270 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I do not support the plan to allow dogs off leash in any public area. The idea of dogs being under "voice control" is an illusion. Dogs cannot always be controlled by their owners at all times. Any dog that is seemingly under control can easily get out of control when another dog is near. Small children are also at risk from unleashed dogs. Even birds and squirrels tend to excite the unleashed dog. Voice control is not an acceptable alternative to leashing dogs in public areas. In my opinion, it is simply too dangerous to let dogs run free where young children are playing.

Organization:

Commenter: kevin morris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 154 **Comment Id:** 349882 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There can be conflicts between dog owners, commercial dog walkers, the dogs, and the general public. This is obvious if not inevitable when public land is in such close proximity to a large urban area. I have been assaulted (by a human) at Crissy Field, for example, and was frustrated that I could not find an NPS LE Officer to report the assault. And, to be honest, when one of the dogs in my care grabbed a picnicker's sandwich, I bought the person a new sandwich. I understand and accept the responsibility of having dogs in a public area, maintain an up to date insurance policy, pick up every dog poop I find, behave as responsibly as I can, and avoid conflict at all costs. But the solution to the potential for conflict is not to remove or further restrict this one user group.

Organization: Seth Green Canine Care

Commenter: Seth Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 157 **Comment Id:** 349893 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Single hikers, especially woman, are safer when they have a dog with them. You are limiting access to the outdoors if you further restrict their ability to walk with a dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah S Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 178 **Comment Id:** 349989 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In particular, closing altogether the East Beach at Crissy Field, and especially the largest part of Baker Beach to dogs altogether, is completely unacceptable. By doing this, you will: 1. Crowd a large amount of dogs into much smaller, adjacent areas, creating overcrowding and potentially dangerous situations.

Organization:

Commenter: Dianne T Younger Rosse **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 193 **Comment Id:** 350083 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: On mixed use, unleashed doges which do not respond to voice commands are a real risk to small children visiting the beach, as parents cannot ascertain if each of these uncontrolled dogs are an immediate risk to thier children or not. Similarly, older people like myself risk falls when uncontrolled dogs jump up on us or trip us. This is a serious risk, and a fall can cause a broken bone, which can be life threatening at my age. And my young nephew who is frighted of uncontrolled dogs cannot visit our beach at all.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathleen McCowin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 194 **Comment Id:** 350085 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It would be a reasonable thing to restrict access to dogs on our pristine beaches. I often could see dogs defecation on Ocean beach which create health hazard to our children who like to enjoy playing on the sand.
Organization:
Commenter: nafiss griffis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 213 **Comment Id:** 350122 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Recreating for a senior citizen is walking with my dog not on leash. On leash is too hard for me and throws off my posture.
Organization:
Commenter: cheryl e traverse **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 221 **Comment Id:** 350137 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I walk my dog off leash at Fort Funston almost every day. This is a great place both for dogs and for their owners. I am elderly and retired. This is the only place where I can go to walk my dog off leash. Please don't take this away from me.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 226 **Comment Id:** 350146 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is very difficult for dog owner, especially seniors and the disabled, to exercise their dogs on-leash. We need large open off-leash spaces to adequately exercise our

pets.

Organization:

Commenter: keith ruoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 230 **Comment Id:** 350152 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I disapprove of the restrictions you intend to implement on the currant off-leash areas of the GGNPS. I am elderly with a knee replacement. I am unable to physically exercise my dog properly on a leash. He gets better quality of exercise, a more natural form of exercise and socialization in these off-leash areas. Please let our dogs have a large off-leash area so they can exercise and be better citizens.

Organization:

Commenter: Shirley Scofield **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 239 **Comment Id:** 350170 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please keep ALL our dogwalking opportunities. For us old people, walking our dogs in these traditional places is how we get our exercise. And they need to run.

Organization:

Commenter: Birrell T Walsh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 268 **Comment Id:** 350385 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Limiting off leash access at Muir beach is a great idea. Sometimes the beach is a big toilet for dogs who have urinated and pooped all over the sand. Owners rarely clean up after their dogs, and it is a health hazard to children and adults as well.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 282 **Comment Id:** 350464 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Part of the reason I moved to Mill Valley and Marin was to be closer to the beauty and trails, and those that allowed me to hike and run with my dog for both of our exercise. I run trails for hours and hours weekly and although appreciate the safe surroundings of Marin, also depend on my dog being an added security measure should something happen to me while out on the trails alone. (remember story of woman in east bay assaulted and raped my a man on the trails while she was running.) I do acknowledge that it is the responsibility of all dog owners to keep their pets under control as well as only allow those that do not risk interference for others but that is just the same as any dog walking on leash or at a dog park. The majority of dog owners are responsible and those dogs under voice control. Please do not ruin our enjoyment due to a few dog owners and look for alternatives to monitor and control them, not the majority.

Organization:
Commenter: Kara N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 285 **Comment Id:** 350468 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is possible to encourage responsible stewardship of our dogs- on & off leash- and eliminating off leash areas will only lead to more "incidents" as those off-leash dog-owners are marginalized into smaller & smaller areas.
Organization:
Commenter: karen eisenstadt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 295 **Comment Id:** 350493 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: With your new and severe restrictions to substantially fewer areas where dogs can be at all, and almost no areas where they can be off-leash, these areas will become overcrowded, worn and rundown. The increased tension of the gathering of a higher concentration of dogs in these limited spaces, having had substantially less exercise, can create conflicts and inevitably aggressive situations with grave repercussions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 300 **Comment Id:** 350541 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SAVE OFF LEASH! Off leash dog walking in GGRNA's off leash areas greatly increases me and my pooch's quality of life on a daily basis. Reducing off leash in GGRNA will cause severe and unsafe crowding in other off leash areas within GGRNA and other San Francisco Parks. Please do not make changes to off leash in GGRNA.
Organization:
Commenter: Lane G Gunsolley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 311 **Comment Id:** 350559 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: For minimum public safety any dog in the National Park should be on a leash. There should be no off leash areas for two reasons: first, as you know, many dog owners will abuse that privilege by allowing their dogs unleashed into leash areas. Second, dogs are animals and therefore totally unpredictable, as anyone who has been around them and whether bitten or not can attest. Even when on leash they injure people, particularly large size dogs that owners cannot control. For that reason I believe the study is remiss in not addressing the hazard of large size dogs in the park.
Organization:
Commenter: Charles P Burns **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 313 **Comment Id:** 350562 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to applaud your efforts to limit dogs in the recreation areas. I fully support these efforts. I have often encountered dogs whose owners have taken them off leash. When the dogs go to the bathroom off the trail, the owners pretend not to notice and do not clean up after them. Additionally, these dogs may have run through poison oak and then run up to people or other dogs, with the potential of spreading poison oak to people. I also note that when I ask the question "Shouldn't your dog be on a leash?," the answers are often hostile with shouting, name calling and use of profane language etc. This is a danger to myself (a single senior citizen and person of color) which I am glad the GG NRA is willing to address and try to limit.

Organization:

Commenter: Fay Shon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 333 **Comment Id:** 350599 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Rancho - as a single woman, hiking with a dog offers more security than when alone (see Pacifica police report encouraging hiking with others). would like access, with dog, to more of Rancho trails. Rancho: where trails emanate from a neighborhood where dog walking has historically occurred, provide some kind of dog walking opportunity.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 335 **Comment Id:** 350609 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off leash dogs protect single women walking alone.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 346 **Comment Id:** 350649 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Facts About the Dangers of Dog Poop. Keep it off the trails and away from creeks! The U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) confirms pet waste can spread parasites including hookworms, ringworms, tapeworms and Salmonella. When infected dog poop comes into contact with your lawn, the poop will eventually "disappear", but the parasite eggs can linger for years! When a human or animal comes into contact with that soil through everyday activities like walking barefoot, gardening or playing, they risk infection from those eggs ... even years after the poop is gone. Pet waste is teaming with E. Coli and other harmful bacteria including fecal coliform bacteria, which causes serious kidney disorders, intestinal illness, cramps and diarrhea in humans. (There are 23 million fecal coliform bacteria in a single gram of pet waste!) Dog poop often contains roundworm larvae, which cause blindness. If a human ingests a roundworm larva, it can migrate through the body causing disease to the

brain, lungs, kidneys, liver, heart or eyes. So when people (especially children) touch soil, dog toys or anything that has been in contact with dog feces and then touch their mouths, they can become infected. Dog poop doesn't just "wash away" or disappear. So if you're not disposing of your dog's waste, you're putting yourself, your family, your dog and your water supply at risk. http://dogtalk101.blogspot.com/2010/01/facts-about-dangers-of-dog-poop.html

Organization:

Commenter: Jerry Jenkins **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 352 **Comment Id:** 350698 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs need exercise and on leash exercise is not sufficient for many dogs larger than a Chihuahua. I am over 60 years old and no longer jog with my dogs. I cannot hike over sand dunes at Fort Funston and want to walk on paved roads while my dogs are off leash. Your "preferred" plan for Fort Funston will make it no longer a place I will want to walk my dogs, so I will not go there anymore. My husband does not walk well and he can only walk on the paved roads and cannot manage a leash as he uses walking poles to maintain balance. He cannot use the off road areas either. So Good bye, Fort Funston. Chrissy Field will get the overflow in a reduced area and will soon show damage. You are creating an environment that will be damaging by upsetting a balance that works right now.

Organization:

Commenter: Judith A Palmer Moran **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 362 **Comment Id:** 351161 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Throughout the process conducted to produce the Plan, I heard residents of San Mateo County ask not to have trail access for dog walkers reduced. As I reviewed the Alternatives, I am concerned by how many trails are being prohibited to dog walkers. By prohibiting access to trails used for decades by both dog walkers and non-dog walkers, it may discourage people from using the parks and trails. Furthermore, many women have expressed to me, including my own wife, that without their dog they would not feel safe walking on open space trails. Having their dog present provides a level of security that otherwise would not be provided.

Organization: San Mateo County Government Center, District 3

Commenter: Don Horsley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 363 **Comment Id:** 351166 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a victim of dog attack, I know that dogs off lease pose a real threat to children and adults using the Presido. This is an inner city park and the access to this area, without threat of attack from personal pets should be a highest use priority.

Organization:

Commenter: Tim Irving **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 367 **Comment Id:** 351269 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In my view, the conclusions are outrageously slanted in favor of dogs and dog owners. Crissy Field is a heavily used urban park, closest to the largest concentration of the public. It naturally should favor use by pedestrians, who include small children, the elderly, disabled people. Your plan continues to put us at risk. I am outraged that dogs will be allowed in all areas and off-leash in some. The most sensible solution is to fence off a portion of the field for use by dogs .Crissy Field should have as is priority the enjoyment and safety of people not the absolute freedom of dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Rosiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 392 **Comment Id:** 351306 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I walk my dog off leash several times a week at the beach at Crissy Field. The walks keep me and my dog happy and healthy, and they also keep her tired and well behaved when we aren't at Crissy Field. Please help me and my dog stay happy & healthy by allowing us to use the open spaces we were promised to run free and enjoy the outdoors - the beautiful outdoor spaces make San Francisco special, and it would be nice if everyone were allowed to continue to enjoy them.

Organization:

Commenter: Mara Klein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 408 **Comment Id:** 351328 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I visit East Beach with my dog almost every day, rain or shine. We've been going there since he was 2 months old and now he's 26 mos. It's the highlight of our day and I love to watch him run with the other dogs he meets there. He's a rhodesian ridgeback and to watch him run in a wide open space is stunning. By limiting the amount of open beach and field, the assigned space will become dangerously crowded and probably unusable. Dogs need open space to run and trying to confine them will present hazards of both people dogs getting run into as well as ruining the enjoyment of visiting the beach field with your dog if it's too overcrowded to join.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 420 **Comment Id:** 351345 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like the GGNRA to have it put on record now that if you restrict so drastically the off leash areas in SF, over time dogs will become less socialized & THEN you may have a safety problem.

Organization:
Commenter: Chris A Eekhrtsbiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 427 **Comment Id:** 351352 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please don't let the dogs ruin the beach, lagoon and stream areas. These should be off limits to dogs. It's such a wonderful place, the headlands, but small beach to have shit and piss all over. Check by your comment sign, there are two stinky piles. You can't trust the owners to be responsible. And who wants to be confronted, woken up, sand kicked on by a dog. Let the dogs go shit and piss on the trails, and have rangers there to give out stiff fines for the assholes who won't clean up. Does every beautiful park and beach have to be ruined by shit and piss; you dare not sit down anywhere. You are making parks toilets. The dogs don't care, they just want the stickiest place to poop; so keep them on the land trails, on leashes, and other less special places.
Organization:
Commenter: Larry Pruss **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 433 **Comment Id:** 351362 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please don't take our dog walking area away. It's saved my health both mentally and physically.
Organization:
Commenter: Shelley d Doran-Jose **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 437 **Comment Id:** 351369 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: GGNRA is an urban park serving a large community that loves the outdoors and nature. Banning people and/or dogs means less places people can exercise - which is good for people, dogs and the health of the community. Please please preserve our dog walking areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine Feist **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 449 **Comment Id:** 351386 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: After reviewing the range of alternatives, including the preferred alternative, I support Alternative A. All other alternatives failed to consider the impact limiting off-leash activity in our Natl. Recreation areas. If space is limited, more off leash dogs, walkers, and owners will be forced together creating increased conflict of dogs and people. The space limitation will cause an increase in dog fights and stress which leads to unwanted animal behavior. Off leash walking creates happy, healthy, and well adjusted dogs. Also it fosters happy athletic owners.

Organization:
Commenter: Leah King **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 455 **Comment Id:** 351393 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Science has shown that dogs help reduce stress in humans. Changing the current rules will make this far more difficult. Please allow us to continue to access the beautiful off-leash areas with our dogs. Please preserve the off leash spaces to allow us to continue as a positive, healthy community.
Organization:
Commenter: Amber Morey-Wu **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1012 **Comment Id:** 351431 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they werent supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Lawrence Skaggs **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1016 **Comment Id:** 351438 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a disabled, retired middle-aged woman who feels safe in the presence of the dog community. My gait is unbalanced enough that trying to walk my dog on leash is relatively dangerous. Please stop seeing those of us who walk at the Fort or at Ocean Beach as the enemy. I stay on paths and can make it down to the beach on some days (wouldn't be able to do that if I was clinging onto a leash).
Organization:
Commenter: Lauris C Jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1048 **Comment Id:** 351483 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also, it could force me, a woman, to walk in isolated areas that don't feel safe.
Organization:
Commenter: Colleen Russell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1069 **Comment Id:** 351522 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I go to Ocean Beach, Chrissy Field and Fort Funston regularly with my dog. We jogg for a few miles or hike for even more. These activities provides me great physical and emotional stimulation that I would not be able to experience in a small dog park or a restricted off-leash area. Please allow me, my family and friends to continue to make urban living sustainable by having easy access to these large park areas in the company of our off-leash dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Sona Aggarwal **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 483 **Comment Id:** 351768 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Hi there, I am in favor of restricting the ability of people to walk their dogs off-leash around other people and animals. It is more important that people feel safe, and are not attacked by dogs while out walking than it is to grant dog-owners the privilege to walk their dogs off-leash.
Organization:
Commenter: D Rich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 492 **Comment Id:** 351788 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am writing to urge you to disallow unleashed pets on hiking trails in the GGNRA. These animals can become a threat to hikers, children, and other animals, and dog attacks on trails can easily become a major issue. It is a small thing to leash a pet. It is a huge tragedy when an unleashed animal attacks and mauls a hiker, child, or pet.
Organization:
Commenter: Thom Morris **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1158 **Comment Id:** 351790 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Humans get much needed exercise too taking their pets to these larger parks that provide lots of walking/running/hiking for both dog and humans, Take this all away and we are left standing in small, overpopulated and heavily congested city parks.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A M N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 493 **Comment Id:** 351793 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Also of valid merit is the fact that this plan pays no consideration to the impacts

on the physical and mental health of both dogs and their owners if dog walking is this severely restricted.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 507 **Comment Id:** 351835 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Women feel more secure when walking with a dog on the trails. Michelle Obama is promoting healthy lifestyles for all Americans and walking with a dog encourages a healthy lifestyle.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Wilder **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 515 **Comment Id:** 351847 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Requiring leashes on the sand ladder at Ft. Funston is unsafe - its hard to keep my footing going down without a dog - Having a dog or 2 on leash pulling you is a serious safety issue

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 531 **Comment Id:** 351877 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Limiting trails that allow dogs creates more conflicts with park users who don't want to hike with dogs by condensing dogs in particular areas/trails

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 540 **Comment Id:** 351890 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Losing off-leash walking area at Crissy will have a great impact on both my health and that of my dog. We booth need to run free to stay healthy. We have no backyard so free recreation on public land is critical to a healthy urban life. I have lived in SF for 50 years and value the urban diversity that recognizes the unique needs of our city people and dogs

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1176 **Comment Id:** 351911 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: They need a place to get out pent-up energy - the children love to play with the

dogs there also. We don't need anymore agressive dog behavior - changing the present rules will have a great impact on this.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Jordan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1196 **Comment Id:** 351959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a senior citizen (81) I have walked my dog at F.F. almost daily since 1980. We as dog owners love F.F. do what we can to keep it safe. I feel if I did not have this place to walk exercise my dog, I would not have reached this age. I have a large dog that need to run fetch balls, at my age there is no way I could exercise him on a leash. Fort Funston has a large community of Senior Citizens who need to be able to walk their dogs off leash. It would be a mistake to limit areas at F.F. You will have more problems from non dog people who will destroy what ever they can.

Organization:

Commenter: Theresa Walker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1240 **Comment Id:** 352048 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The prospect of banning dogs in the GGNR is ridiculous, and unfair. It punishes those of us that keep our dogs on leash AND those of us (like myself) that have a physical condition where having a dog could be the difference between hazard & safety. I suffer from M.S. I hike using an ankle brace, two poles, and a knee brace. My dog is trained to pick up things I drop, help me regain my balance if I fall, and give me support when needed. To ban her from the trails is to ban me. Seems very biased against those with disabilities.

Organization:

Commenter: linda mannella **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1253 **Comment Id:** 352177 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose thus plan due to the lack of off leash dog areas and the ban on dogs from many trails. As single women it is a safety issue to have my dog and there are other ways to discourage irresponsible dog owners than a ban.

Organization:

Commenter: Rebecca L Jorgenson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1327 **Comment Id:** 352317 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep dog access, so people will exercise their pooches and themselves , lowering costs for medications for diabetes, hypertension, and depression.

Organization: Service dog tutor

Commenter: Jean D Cary **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1340 **Comment Id:** 352358 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Having an off leash area to walk my dog in Golden Gate Park helps me have someplace to walk each day and helps maintain my health. I hope that you will consider off leash areas for walking my dog for my sake.
Organization:
Commenter: Claudia Zeiler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1358 **Comment Id:** 352392 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Allowing dogs only on Rodeo Beach would also have the unwanted effect of making that beach very, very densely used by dog owners, and would create a *dangerous* environment there for both people and dogs due to the extra chaos created by an overblown density of people and dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael L Myers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1362 **Comment Id:** 352394 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog behaviorists will inform you that off leash exercise is essential to the physical and behavioral health of all larger canines. Frankly, I was a bit surprised at the sheer number of dogs over 50# that daily attended Fort Funston. One might expect a few less, in an area so deficient in open space. It is well known that dogs greet each other best when left to their own devices, the act of restraining a dog, in the presence of another, can instigate violent behavior. The disparity in the numbers of bad incidents at Fort Funston, as opposed to those of Crissy Field seem to bear that out. We all know the damage to life and property that an out of control 75# dog can do... In the interest of public safety, the only logical course of action would be to leave a good thing alone.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher F Norgaar **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1371 **Comment Id:** 352407 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Reducing the areas where dogs are free to be dogs will make it difficult for dog-owners in the Bay Area to exercise their dogs (and themselves), and this will result in (a) overcrowding of existing dog runs in the City parks, and (b) increased dog aggression since they will not be as tired and happy as they currently are.
Organization:
Commenter: Leora Goren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1393 **Comment Id:** 352437 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need to burn off their energy to remain balanced and well-behaved, and sometimes the only way their owners can help them do that is by letting them run off leash. I am not a marathon runner, but my dog is, and she needs more places - not fewer - where she can get proper space to run. If you cut back on off-leash areas in and around the city you will definitely start to see the results in the behavior of the under-exercised, unbalanced dogs who will begin to act out because they will no longer have proper outlets to expend their energy.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1419 **Comment Id:** 352520 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: One thing is certain: the consequence of sending southern Marin dog owners into their cars to walk their dogs someplace further afield would be more traffic, more fuel emissions, and less exercise for local residents. None of that is in keeping with the National Park Service's mission.

Organization:

Commenter: Kaitlin Quistgard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 587 **Comment Id:** 352679 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog waste also becomes a repulsive problem. And, though I love to see dogs chasing one another, this play can be hazardous for folks who are less steady on their feet and not expecting to be rushed or bumped by a passing dog. We should have some areas where this concern does not present itself.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine E Fowler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 591 **Comment Id:** 352686 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I strongly support the ban on dogs and off-leash dog walking at the Racho Corral de Tierra location. It has gotten so bad that I do not feel comfortable bringing my children, ages 7 and 4, to that location. They have been harassed and almost bitten numerous times. When I nicely ask the dog owners to please keep their dogs on a leash, I am mostly ignored and occasionally threatened or verbally abused by the dog owner. This is not a tenable situation. I believe the choice has to be framed as to whether dog enjoyment of the open space is more important than human enjoyment of the open space.

Organization:

Commenter: Sean Handel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 618 **Comment Id:** 352744 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am also concerned about the safety of children and people who are not comfortable around dogs. They have a right to enjoy areas of the park free of being barked at or jumped on by dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Marsha J Feinland **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2066 **Comment Id:** 352753 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: In addition, dogs provide safety on trails from persons whom might be a threat to an unsuspecting individual. There have been assault crimes reported over the years on these trails and our canine friends provide much needed safety where rangers cannot be present.
Organization:
Commenter: Doug MacIntosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 624 **Comment Id:** 352761 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I feel that uncontrolled dogs are a threat to children and the elderly. I certainly do not believe that dogs should be off leash in the Presidio.
Organization: California Native Plant Society
Commenter: Jean Conner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 635 **Comment Id:** 352786 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: This plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily ignores the needs of Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their canine companions. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.
Organization:
Commenter: Renee A Richards **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 639 **Comment Id:** 352797 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily ignores the needs of Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their dogs. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.
Organization:

Commenter: annie klebahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 654 **Comment Id:** 352832 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As it is now, dogs in large and small numbers pass each other on the streets, in the parks, on trails and on beaches, playfully, peacefully and naturally. They've figured it out. They are well exercised, social and socialized. With the proposed new and severe restrictions to significantly fewer areas where dogs can be at all, and almost no areas where they can be off-leash, these areas will become overcrowded, overrun and rundown. The increased tension of the gathering of higher concentrations of dogs in these limited spaces, having had substantially less exercise, can create conflicts and inevitably aggressive situations with grave repercussions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 663 **Comment Id:** 352852 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Unmanaged animals should not be allowed in any recreational area or trial. One reason is safety (Foster, 2006). When there are large groups of people and dogs, aggression from one animal toward another dog and/or human can result in injuries. Unmanaged animals without proper training and control may have more aggression and can play roughly, resulting in fights and injuries. They may also scare children and a parent or another adult may injure the dog, even if the dog did not physically harm the child.
Organization:
Commenter: Faith Wall **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1486 **Comment Id:** 352884 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not restrict dog walking or off leash areas, these areas are so important to our dogs and our community, espcially at crissy field. Dogs need a place to run free, this makes people happier and dogs more relaxed and well behaved when they are walking on the city streets or interacting with humans. it is so important for dogs to get a lot of exercise, and this will become extremely difficult, especially for disabled people or people who can not walk, for their dogs to get enough exercise. Please consider the dogs and the disabled dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: alan l robin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1525 **Comment Id:** 353005 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We hear all the time how important it is to socialize dogs so the do not become dangerous threats. If the places that we socialize disapear how will anyone be able to do the right thing? Won't that increase the number reports of injury caused by dogs when they are in public.

Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Hopewell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 713 **Comment Id:** 353012 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Safety. I like my animal with me for safety reasons. My dog is a safety net for my solo walks. The Pacifica, CA police issued a statement that women should not walk alone after a single female hiker was annonymously videoed on a Montara Mountain trail.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan E Messner Whipp **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1549 **Comment Id:** 353077 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This policy change is an unacceptable restriction on the lives of dog owners and dog walkers. There are more dogs than children in this city, and they depend on exercise for good behavior just like we do. Eliminating off-leash areas for dogs to run will result in higher bite incidents, more euthanasia of problem animals, and lower mental health for dogs and dog owners alike.
Organization:
Commenter: Gordon Rowe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1573 **Comment Id:** 353139 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I love FF and my dog as well. If off leash areas are restricted as you plan, it will be overcrowded in the areas where we can actually keep them off leash. You set up problems, dog aggressions will increase.
Organization:
Commenter: Bettina N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1586 **Comment Id:** 353156 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: By restricting these parks, you are also limiting the amount of exercise pet owners get when they take their dogs for a walk. For example, the loop my husband and I walk at Fort Funston every day is just under two miles of various topography. In addition to it being a great workout, we love coming here WITH OUR OFF LEASH DOG, to take in the scenery (it never gets old).
Organization:
Commenter: Vivian Sakovich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 763 **Comment Id:** 353166 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am concerned about the small spaces provided for off-leash activity. I fear that it would force too many walkers and dogs into the limited spaces provided and a whole new range of problems would arise from the over-crowding. I feel that if such large areas were deemed off limits, some spaces should be created to off set the restrictions.

Organization: Dog Trot by Chris

Commenter: Chris Petersen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1618 **Comment Id:** 353187 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: And finally, such restrictions will not limit my ability to exercise but also force me to increase my use of car and gas, hence, it is bad for public health and for the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Leproust **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1747 **Comment Id:** 353190 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: please consider the negative impact this will have on the lives of pet dogs and their owners. The off-leash policy currently encourages pet dogs and their owners to use the spaces frequently for the enjoyment of nature and for physical exercise. Restrictive changes to this policy will discourage people from using the spaces with regularity and diminish the quality of so many lives.

Organization:

Commenter: Carly Earnshaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2021 **Comment Id:** 353198 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: the health and well-being of our community will drastically suffer without proper dog-friendly recreation areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Lara McCaskill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2153 **Comment Id:** 353199 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I just can't imagine our pets not getting the exercise they really need and receive from off leash walks. Can you imagine a city full of under exercised dogs and the problems that will cause!

Organization:

Commenter: Debbie Rutledge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1636 **Comment Id:** 353232 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And finally, these restrictions will negatively impact my life and the life of my family, including my canine companion. I am a teacher who lives in the city and utilize the GGRNA to exercise and socialize. Limiting access to this facility for canines will limit my ability to keep my dog active and in good health.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2213 **Comment Id:** 353253 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: When you leash dogs, they become more aggressive and it is OUTRAGEOUS that Marin County would only offer ONE beach to exercise our dogs, and ourselves. Many studies show how important it is to humans to have dog companions and to restrict us with leash laws makes the experience unhealthy and more dangerous.

Organization:

Commenter: Lesa Kramer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 771 **Comment Id:** 353259 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Small children are often knocked over and sometimes bitten. The children and their parents and caretakers need to be able to enjoy our parks without worrying about run ins with aggressive canines.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 792 **Comment Id:** 353298 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: please restore balance to the golden gate nra by restricting dogs off leash. my wheelchair bound husband has been physically intimidated by dogs off leash on various occasions; owners either did not have dogs under control or appeared not to care. one owner was aggressive and hostile toward my husband when he asked her to control her dog.

Organization:

Commenter: kit cameron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3181 **Comment Id:** 353315 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Our community's health and sense of well-being will be negatively affected by these restrictions, especially as there are no resources that can serve as substitutes for the GGNRA's walking/hiking trails and off-leash areas.

Organization:
Commenter: Teresa Goodman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 823 **Comment Id:** 353366 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs on leashes do NOT cause problems other than waste management. It has been my experience that Marin County dog owners are extremely conscientious about picking up their dog litter, and so what is the logic in the further restriction of dogs on our magnificent hills.
Organization:
Commenter: Sherry Thomas-Healy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 847 **Comment Id:** 353410 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The generous off-leash areas in San Francisco are in fact an important safety valve, because dogs who are well exercised are almost never aggressive in more restrained situations like small city parks and sidewalks. Dogs who are never allowed off leash can become anxious and unpredictable, which is much more of a concern than dogs running free and relaxed in wide-open areas like Baker and Crissy Beaches.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1655 **Comment Id:** 353480 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Individuals who visit nature are healthier, both physically and emotionally, so discouraging people from public lands would directly impair the general health of society.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne Bell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1678 **Comment Id:** 353548 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have been using the GGNRA almost daily to exercise myself and my dog. It is most important for both our continued well being.The proposed plan is far too restrictive. I have in my practice suggested that people acquire dogs to assure that they would participate in outdoor healthful activities. Please reconsider the restrictions for the health of many citizens besides myself. I urge you to maintain off leash areas as most dogs can be controlled without a leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Stuart Schwartz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 879 **Comment Id:** 353555 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Getting out and walking with your dog has been proven to increase mental and physical health. Reducing the places dogs can walk in the city, will increase stress, mental illness and physical ailments.

Organization:

Commenter: S. J Ong **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3729 **Comment Id:** 353598 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: s you know diabetes and a host of other health issues plague our country from lack of activity. What was once a rural county of farmers has shifted to urban desk workers and our health is at stake. Just like libraries were set up to establish low-costs way of educating Americans, parks need to accommodate our health. We all know that pets lower blood pressure and balance stress, but its much more than that. We are in a position to consider the evolution of the urban environment and we need to find balance that supports healthy lifestyles.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie C Edelman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1695 **Comment Id:** 353648 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Well-socialised and well-exercised dogs are happy and healthy dogs, who in turn are well-behaved dogs. My dog is a part of my family, and I take him with me when I go out. Why are we being asked to leave our well-trained and well-behaved dogs at home, rather than taking them out with us so that we all remain healthy?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1755 **Comment Id:** 353739 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the current plan for many reasons: dogs kept on-leash are almost always more aggressive, dog fights are occurring more frequently in dog parks due to overcrowding(there was a near-fatal attack at the MV dog park last week.) as well as a place for being a vector for parasites,

Organization:

Commenter: Sharon Salisbury **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1756 **Comment Id:** 353741 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the

GGNRAs original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan FAILS to do.

Organization:

Commenter: Catherine Foreman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1769 **Comment Id:** 353754 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If GGNRA's Dog Management Plan is passed, the remaining off leash areas would become hazardously overcrowded. Their would be a huge increase in the number of under exercised and under socialized dogs, which only spells disaster and poses huge danger to EVERYONE. Under exercised and under socialized dogs are more likely to be out of control and the likelihood of them biting someone would be greatly increased.

Organization:

Commenter: Charles Nieman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 945 **Comment Id:** 353805 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This plan is not well thought out at all, and does not seem to take safety considerations into account. Dogs need safe designated areas in order to run off their excess energy (from being cooped up in houses, living in a metropolitan area) and to learn socialization skills in a non-threatening space. Dogs who do not get enough chance to run and play become nervous, making them aggressive with not only other dogs, but people as well.

Organization:

Commenter: Rebecca M Coolidge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2143 **Comment Id:** 353831 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: We would have to drive far distances to find appropriate areas to run off leash. And, my dog would have extra energy. Image all the dogs in the city with all that extra energy, this seems extremely dangerous to me.

Organization:

Commenter: Megan Synnestvedt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4745 **Comment Id:** 353845 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: My dogs visit GGNRA lands at least 5 days a week, and those visits are critical to their health and vitality; not to mention my own. TAKING AWAY OUR ACCESS IS AN ACT OF CRUELTY; GGNRA FACILITIES ARE WHAT MAKES IT POSSIBLE TO HUMANELY KEEP A DOG IN THIS OVERCROWDED REGION.

Organization:

Commenter: Jacqueline Harlow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4753 **Comment Id:** 353846 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: If Fort Funston's off-leash recreation is prohibited or curtailed, the quality of my life will suffer dramatically. That's not an overstatement. Running my dogs at Fort Funston has been a large part of my enjoyment of San Francisco - - I go there to take exercise for myself and to visit with other dogs and dogs owners regularly.
Organization:
Commenter: Margaret E Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4767 **Comment Id:** 353848 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: PLEASE CONSIDER that a good many people regard their dogs as family, and the exercise and rigor of off leash walks keep a great many in the Bay Area with marginal MENTAL HEALTH stable and engaged with the world in positive ways.
Organization:
Commenter: Jon Engdahl **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4769 **Comment Id:** 353849 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: And as a woman, often running alone, I feel safer with my dog by my side.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine M Malone **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 959 **Comment Id:** 354160 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: People aren't going to just get rid of their dogs if Alternative F is passed, and restricting all those existing dogs to such a small area is bound to create problems of over usage as well as dog conflicts. Additionally, dogs without sufficient exercise and freedom can be aggressive and are certainly not as happy or acceptable as well-cared for dogs who are allowed to have a reasonable amount of exercise and freedom.
Organization:
Commenter: Gail C High **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1823 **Comment Id:** 354262 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: YOU WILL HAVE MORE DOG-BITING ON YOUR HANDS IF YOU REMOVE THEIR RIGHTS .
Organization:
Commenter: philis bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1828 **Comment Id:** 354271 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed restrictions in GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan are severe, unwarranted, and oppressive to all responsible and law abiding dog owners and their pets. If implemented, these restrictions will severely compromise our ability to provide the necessary care to our pets. Any dog behaviorist will tell you that well socialized dogs are also critical for the safety of other people and animals as positive socialization mitigates fear based reactions. This is a health and safety issue for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: Wade Crosson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1833 **Comment Id:** 354294 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Contrary to a statement in the Golden Gate National Parks Plan draft (p.34), dog parvovirus is species specific and NOT transmissible to humans, as human parvovirus is not transmissible to dogs, according to the CDC (http://www.cdc.gov/parvovirusB19/). Furthermore, E.coli is omnipresen5 and part of the natural bacterial fauna found in the intestines of all mammals. The strain that is hazardous to humans comes from contaminated beef, not dogs. There is NO evidence of E.coli from dogs causing any problem in humans.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 1834 **Comment Id:** 354302 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am near certain of the impact though; less active dogs, with pent up energy in a city with so many dogs = a lot more acting out, overcrowding of the few dog areas in the city and therefor more dog issues between dogs and with people. Restricting off leash areas just because will not be without ramifications; why do it????

Organization:

Commenter: Alan B Brisbon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1893 **Comment Id:** 354482 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a professional dog behaviorist and trainer who's lived and worked in San Francisco for over 15 years, I know from experience how important these areas are for our dogs' and people's health and well being. Dogs need to be able to run and play in large spaces and even trained in these spaces. Without proper exercise and training, almost all dogs will exhibit behavior issues. These behavior problems can be as minor as destruction of household items and mild separation anxiety to dangerous aggression towards other dogs and humans.

Organization:

Commenter: Beverly Ulbrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1982 **Comment Id:** 354645 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And finally, this proposal creates the potential for many unplanned consequences for dogs, their owners, and for the entire local community. Dogs need exercise, and if they get less of it due to new complexity for their owners in accessing off-leash areas, I believe incidents of aggressive canine behavior will increase. Dogs need to walk and run, and if they are not given this opportunity, the pent-up energy is expressed in much less desirable ways.
Organization:
Commenter: Cedric Brehaut **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1983 **Comment Id:** 354646 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: LOSING ANY OFF LEASH SPACE IS A HARDSHIP AND WILL AFFECT MY HEALTH.
Organization:
Commenter: SUSAN F GEARHART **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1986 **Comment Id:** 354649 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also there is no area in the city where there is as much real estate for off leash area. So now the much smaller proposed off leash areas will become way more crowded and there will be a greater chance of dog fights and injuries, and a greater chance of catching illnesses for the dogs as they are exposed to more dogs/germs in a smaller, more crowded space.
Organization:
Commenter: loretta j jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1997 **Comment Id:** 354664 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would like to oppose the plan. Hiking in dog allowed area, especially off leash area, provides me with my weekly exercise. There are already too little parks on the peninsula that allows dog. Even less parks allow for off leash walking. If parks doesn't allow for dogs, I will have even less choice for exercising.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2009 **Comment Id:** 354679 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please reconsider reducing areas for off leash dog play. I cannot adequately

exercise my dog if he must remain on a leash. I worry that the remaining off leash areas will become terribly over crowded that the dogs will become stressed and they won't be a safe place for exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Mara Aaberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2014 **Comment Id:** 354686 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: By limiting the space for pets not only are we are building a community of unhealthy pets but we are also building a community of unhealthy people who rely on these sites to exercise, walk, and enjoy nature. San Francisco is becoming a city where there are more pets than children and we need these sites to cater to the needs of the pet owners and the pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Jacob M Aringo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2035 **Comment Id:** 354706 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I believe that dogs need to be on leashes for many safety reasons. First, their is human saftey, where little children can be overwhelmed by a huge dog streaking by off leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Jaime C Kooser **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2657 **Comment Id:** 354808 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you have a large population of dogs that are not allowed to be a true dog and enjoy this open space, you will have a large population of extremely frustrated dogs that could lead to aggressive behavioral problems.

Organization:

Commenter: Jami M Nadzam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2822 **Comment Id:** 354875 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog parks in SF are rare, too small and too far away, and the plan fails to account for how un-exercised dogs on crowded sidewalks and streets will pose far more harm to people than trained dogs playing in safe rural off-leash areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Katy Walden **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2903 **Comment Id:** 355189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there are thousands and thousands of us who walk our dogs every day to stay healthy & fit, with our dogs safely under control - dogs can & need to run around and walk way way further than humans - they NEED to be able to run around while we walk

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Janet Standen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2910 **Comment Id:** 355201 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred a.lter.native described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent people like myself from recreating with our dogs for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Kristin Kelly **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2929 **Comment Id:** 355227 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for the past 8 years.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Peter Olfe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2930 **Comment Id:** 355231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed policies have an adverse impact on the disabled and elderly, and on people that might not feel com fortable visiting our beautiful parks without their dogs in tow: for example women trying to exercise by themselves or simply going for a walk alone.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: karin mac donald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3651 **Comment Id:** 355395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our pets need a place to run free off leash-.-.it's imperative for their health. Also, at a time when the country is facing a public health (obesity) crisis, our government entities should not be erecting barriers that make exercise less accessible.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Alexis Petrakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3671 **Comment Id:** 355590 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will directly affect my health and quality of life in negative ways. My dog and I take daily outings to public recreation locations including Ocean Beach, Ft. Funston, Lands End, the Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach, and others. If I were unable to exercise with my dog, my Type 1 diabetes would be much harder to manage and I would likely die much sooner as the result.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Gillian Ladd **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3890 **Comment Id:** 355636 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Take away this right and you will have animals with pent-up energy and aggression-.-.in other words, creating a new problem!
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Adrianne Bee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2109 **Comment Id:** 355737 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I disagree with the premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area.
Organization:
Commenter: Denise F Selleck **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2141 **Comment Id:** 355784 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Too many dogs on a small territory would cause fights and wouldn't be safe for dogs and the dog walkers/dog parents.
Organization:
Commenter: Dominika Knossalla **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2151 **Comment Id:** 355801 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: GGNRA has already excluded dog access from more than 75% o the beaches, trails and open spaces. This has presumably helped protect wildlife but has also concentrated the dog activity into the remaining spaces. Further restriction will increase usage yet more making the remaining dog-friendly areas even more burdened and encourage scofflaws to take their dogs further afield.
Organization: individual

Commenter: John M Stiggelbout **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4206 **Comment Id:** 355979 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because in San Francisco more people own pets than have kids. It is vitally important for the health of the com munity to have off-leash dog areas. Both non-dog owners as well as dog owners benefit from having healthy dogs who are well socialized in the com munity.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Dori Melton **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4461 **Comment Id:** 355996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is exclusive and discriminative towards these animals. A drastic 90% dcrease in recreation space available greatly affects the well-being of both animals and owners.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Hillary Acer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4473 **Comment Id:** 356012 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252).
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Theresa Gaydon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5354 **Comment Id:** 356020 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because having a safe place for dogs to be prevents them from congregating in less safe areas.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Robert Baron **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2240 **Comment Id:** 356857 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Designated dog parks for off leash use are a benefit to our society as it is a place for a large group of our population to congregate and enjoy the outdoors with our fellow neighbors. Removal of such a place will lead to increased issues with dog walkers on confined sidewalks and increased issues with dog waste on sidewalks.

Organization:

Commenter: Isaac West **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2607 **Comment Id:** 356868 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: With only 1% o GGNRA lands dedicated to off-leash access, further restricting off-leash access can only offer small (if any) gains versus the enormous impact to the 10,000 dog visitors per day, the health of dog owners whose primary exercise is walking their dogs, and the subsequent overcrowding of city dog areas, insufficient dog exercise and socialization which will lead to further overcrowding of abandoned dog shelters

Organization:

Commenter: art gallagher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2615 **Comment Id:** 356882 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who lives in the city of San Francisco and walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Adam French **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2638 **Comment Id:** 356959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I grew up riding the GGNRA with a horse, and parents allowed us to ride alone because one of the girls had a dog following us everywhere for safety. The dog would have warned us of danger, scared away predators, or gone for help if something would have happened. This would not be possible if dogs are not allowed to accompany their owners.

Organization: DotGreen Foundation

Commenter: Annalisa M Roger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2647 **Comment Id:** 356986 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA (specifically Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara), I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the

preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on this property for many, many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah Mortensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2648 **Comment Id:** 356988 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I was just wondering where are we going to walk our dogs off-leash if this passes. If everyone has to go to the small, enclosed off-leash areas around the city, then one is asking for an awful amount of trouble...both between dogs and owners

Organization:

Commenter: Mark Sedgwick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2671 **Comment Id:** 357026 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The PA would significantly and adversely impact the way we have been using GGNRA areas for both fun and health, for all three of us, for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Armstrong **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2732 **Comment Id:** 357151 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Douglas Bentz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2753 **Comment Id:** 357194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For many local dog guardians, especially seniors and others who find it difficult exercise their pets while on-leash, the GGNRA is the only place where they can let their dogs play and release a lot of energy. As the SF SPCA can attest, daily exercise is essential to a dog's proper health and well-being. Exercise affects a dog's behavior, trainability and aggression levels, which are important to properly maintaining public safety in crowded urban environments. Take away off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA, and dog guardians may be unable to meet the physical and mental needs of their pets (also at a detriment to their own healthy, active lifestyles).

Organization: San Francisco SPCA

Commenter: Brandy Kuentzel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2275 **Comment Id:** 357295 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Walking with my dog makes me feel safer and as a senior citizen I am a potential victim of crime. Walking with my dog gives me needed recreation.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Sheats **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2765 **Comment Id:** 357388 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I live at Ocean Beach in San Francisco, and I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Jacob K Lesnik **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2770 **Comment Id:** 357416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a proud long-time San Francisco resident and someone who walks regularly with my dog at Ocean Beach, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is shortsighted, restrictive, and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and the health of my community the way I have on GGNRA properties for over ten years.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2783 **Comment Id:** 357447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The proposed GGNRA restrictions on off leash dog walking will have a severe impact on my dogs and the health and happiness of my pets and my family.
Organization:
Commenter: alison lufkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357472 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If it were not for my dog, I would not get out and get this exercise nor would my dog. These are the only places in the Bay Area where we can run, play ball, splash in the ocean. The NPS changes will seriously impact the physical and mental health of countless people

and their pets as well as the livelihoods of those who make their livings working with dogs outdoors.

Organization: Dog City Tours

Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2792 **Comment Id:** 357483 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to express my sadness about and opposition to the alternatives laid out in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying recreation time with my dog for my own health as I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Cunningham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2808 **Comment Id:** 357528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We enjoy taking our dog the off leash to join other dogs in play. Without these options I worry his health as well as ours will be impacted by limiing play in off leash areas to small areas and with the potential for overcrowding

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2818 **Comment Id:** 357551 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea B **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2873 **Comment Id:** 357705 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Any reduction to on or off-leash dog areas will only result in the remaining areas getting more crowded. In turn, this will only worsen any conflicts or incidents. For the record, although GGNRA/NPS claims to want to reduce such conflicts, it appears they in fact want to increase the likelihood of such incidents so they can then use these incidents as grounds for yet further reductions until they achieve their backhanded goal of minimizing dog access.

Organization: SaveOffLeash.com

Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3090 **Comment Id:** 357895 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you take these areas away from dog owners, so many problems will turn up...the parks will be over-crowded...there will, as a result, be more incidents involving dogs and people...dogs and dogs, etc. I don't own a dog, but I do not want to have to deal with these new issues of over-crowding.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3185 **Comment Id:** 357957 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a service-connected (disability rated) Vietnam veteran, I have found that this has improved my quality of life immensely and decreased my PTSD. Not only is the physical exercise beneficial to me and my dog, so is the ability to socialize with other dog owners and frequently other veterans who are dog owners. Please don't take this capability away from us as it will have a major negative effect on our quality of life. Please reconsider your proposed changes.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard Milner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3214 **Comment Id:** 357989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please save off leash dog areas. The most dangerous dogs are those with pent up energy due to not getting enough exercise and that energy getting redirected in the form of aggression. Restricting off leash will therefore create more dangerous dogs
Organization:
Commenter: Petra Steen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3357 **Comment Id:** 358229 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It has been a recreational, energizing and healthy time for us, also rewarded by the resulting socialization with neighbors and the community.This has been the character of our region. As such, again I'm expressing my concern and opposition to the 'preferred alternative' described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.It is frighteningly restrictive and would prevent me and my dog from many years of the healthy recreation, enjoyed over so many years.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3378 **Comment Id:** 358290 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: According to your own statistics, dog incidents account for such a small percentage of the problems. To funnel dogs to smaller and smaller areas is a sure way to cause problems.

Organization:

Commenter: pam herz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3389 **Comment Id:** 358309 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new restriction would limit that access to my dog and the many dogs in the area, forcing their owners to walk their animals in more densely populated areas where problems between dogs and other recreation users could arise.

Organization:

Commenter: Molly Hartle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2389 **Comment Id:** 358885 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If off leash usage of the GGNRA's land is severely restricted by dogs and their owners as proposed, there will also be an negative impact on dog/dog and dog/human interactions. Namely, when dogs are able to exercise, socialize, and play off leash, there are fewer attacks, fights, and bites. This fact is certainly supported by the comments made by researchers and veterinarians. Is the irresponsible change proposed by the GGNRA going to result in more injuries.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert I Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2394 **Comment Id:** 358893 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support requiring leashes for dogs. Although many are well-behaved, about 10% ae out of control - - jumping on people, harrassing other dogs, and definitely not under any voice command. It's unsafe and it creates a tense atmosphere for everyone else. The safety and comfort of *people* need to come above that of dogs or their owners; and the safety of protected local species needs to have priority over stir-crazy dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2483 **Comment Id:** 358985 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: vast areas of land and the beaches of this beautiful coast are not just for humans to enjoy. Animals, specifically dogs, are a part of our lives and our families. This will be a detriment to the active lifestyles that so many Californians lead. In terms of the health of the

animals, it is a proven fact that problems arise with dogs that are cooped up and have no outlet to run free. If this plan is enacted it will be the core reason for a multitude of new problems.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2507 **Comment Id:** 359006 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Limiting the number the number of dogs per walker is important to public safety and, potentially, to protecting the Park against liability. However, a large pack (and most dog walkers have 8 or more dogs) may have two or more aggressive dogs, and when that happens they behave like a hunting pack, circling an individual so that only one dog can be faced at a time. Furthermore, a group of dogs will behave far more aggressively than an individual. All of this is in addition to the difficulty of controlling a large group. The current sizes of dogs groups with a single walker make the park experience risky and unpleasant for other users, and frequently for other dog walkers.

Organization:

Commenter: John P Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2517 **Comment Id:** 359017 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please leave the Off Leash areas as they are. If you must change them, add MORE space for off leash exercise and play. According to a study reported by the American Psychological Assoc, people with pets are happier, healthier and better adjusted than those without. Pets and people need exercise to get to or maintain a healthy body and mind. What better exercise than going to the beach to walk and run around. San Francisco is currently constructing a lot of condos and apartments, many of which will allow pets. City parks are already crowded and the GGNRA areas are a great place to go to lessen the crowds. Please DO NOT take away the off leash areas

Organization: Dolores Park Dogs

Commenter: Jill D Inderdohnen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2557 **Comment Id:** 359080 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support the Preferred Alternative because I am tired of chasing away off-leash dogs that approach my family. My son has been attack by off-leash dogs at his school, which does not allow off leash pets of any kind. As a child I was also attacked by an off-leash dog at a park. Large pets and all dogs should be leashed in public areas at all times, excepted for designated off-leash areas. Protect our families, not the dog owners that think they are entitled because they bought a dog and did not have an adequate private yard for their pet.

Organization:

Commenter: John Weerts **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2564 **Comment Id:** 359092 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs make walkers and hikers feel safe providing motivation to exercise: On more than one occasion my dog and I have been approached by coyotes on Mori trail. We have also encountered people camping/sleeping in the bushes. Having my dog with me makes me feel safe and provides additional motivation.

Organization:

Commenter: A C **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2594 **Comment Id:** 359133 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I believe that the parks should provide a safe environment for all of its users. The US Parks are NOT A DOG PARK. Dog feces on beach are a serious health hazard (and disgusting), especially at the beach where children and adults are barefoot. Additionally dogs are a hazard to wild life.

Organization:

Commenter: Henry Gunst **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3417 **Comment Id:** 359151 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It has been scientifically proven that owning a dog increases your lifespan! Numerous studies have shown that dog ownership lowers your blood pressure, encourages exercise, decreases stress and loneliness, lowers your cholesterol and thus enhances your health. Dogs can sniff out some forms of cancer and recognize early signs of seizures, enabling them to warn their human companion to lie down to prevent injury. Additionally dogs can be trained to be a Certified Therapy Dog and and you can partner up with your dog and volunteer your services visiting sick patients in the hospital or troubled children in school. Animal-assisted therapy is designed to improve the physical, social, emotional and/or cognitive functioning of the patient, as well as providing educational and motivational effectiveness for participants. The experience is incredibly rewarding.

Organization:

Commenter: Lindsay C Kefauver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3419 **Comment Id:** 359154 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have walked at Crissy Field for almost 30 years and have always been uneasy about unleashed dogs on the east beach. In warmer weather, and low tides, lots of toddlers enjoy wading in the shallows. Lots of dogs also enjoy dashing around either in search of a ball or just for the hell of it. It is a bad combination. On the west beach, that is not a problem. There may be children enjoying the beach but generally they are up toward the grassy dunes and not in the water, which along that shore is not shallow enough for them to invite play. The Park service plan to allow off-leash dogs on the Crissy west beach makes sense, but not, of course, in the

snowy plover's protected breeding area. Off-leash dogs have never made sense to me on the east beach- -a serious dog-toddler encounter waiting to happen, usually due to the dog's admittedly delightful exuberance. The two just don't belong together on that beach. Moreover, once the dogs are given unleashed freedom on the east beach, they are much more likely at low tide to go under the foot bridge over the lagoon's outlet into the Bay and chase the many birds that feed and spend time there. Behavior I have seen a number of times. The calls of the owner are to no avail. Keep unleashed dogs off East Crissy Field Beach

Organization: Dolphin Club, SF International Ocean Film Festival

Commenter: Sidney J Hollister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3428 **Comment Id:** 359210 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are no off leash areas in San Mateo county so We really enjoy going to Fort Funston and Crissy Field. We have been going there for years and am very sad that most of the land will be taken away for off leash dog walking. We have 2 very active dogs that require running space. When you limit the areas there will be very close encounters with people and dogs that probably will cause many confrontations and problems. Our exercise will also be limited which doesn't help our well being.

Organization:

Commenter: Sylvia M Samuolis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3625 **Comment Id:** 359264 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are already too few areas within the GGNRA in which dogs can be walked off leash. Off leash walking is necessary to the health of the dogs and their human companions who live in the Bay Area. If off leash walking within the GGNRA is further restricted as proposed, it is less likely that dogs will be able to run free. As a result, they may become anxious, stressed and agressive while on leash. This is not good for the human community.

Organization:

Commenter: Eleanor M Roman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3780 **Comment Id:** 359594 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: public safety and health are currently at serious risk by the misuse of our parks by dogs, dog owners, and dog walkers. The general condition of our parks and continued beneficial use by people with children also is at risk. In short, the parks are being used as glorified dog runs and toilets at the expense of the general public, and most particularly children

Organization:

Commenter: Lex F. and Bobbi Lynn Campbell and Jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4019 **Comment Id:** 359872 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please keep option A. I am dismayed at how our liberties are getting more and more limited. Governments at every level are trying to get us to live straight-jacketed lives. I don't own a dog. But watching dogs run freely nurtures me; they have so much joy it is contagious. Humans need some places that are not inundated with restrictive laws. Everyone is so stressed. They need an outlet. Taking a walk or run with your dog on undeveloped land is a total stress release.

Organization:

Commenter: Carolyn Alter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3805 **Comment Id:** 359881 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: She plays there with the other dogs, runs along the beach, and splashes in the ocean. It's crucial for her to get this exercise and to socialize with other dogs. Not having this outlet truly scares me, because too much pent up energy never makes for a safe situation.

Organization:

Commenter: Leah D Wanta **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4027 **Comment Id:** 359967 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Restricting off-leash access to only a few beaches (is Rodeo Beach the only one?) will cause Rodeo Beach to be overwhelmed with dog owners seeking off-leash beach access for their dogs. It will inevitably result in significant increases not only in the numbers of dogs there, but also conflicts among dogs, dog waste, and other undesirable effects of so many dogs in a small area. In effect, it would turn Rodeo Beach into a "dog concentration camp". Contrary to one of the stated purposes of the Plan, it is likely to INCREASE USER CONFLICTS at Rodeo Beach. This can benefit no one.

Organization:

Commenter: Alan B Mullendore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3941 **Comment Id:** 360107 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The greatly increased restrictions and limited access in the proposed Dog Management Plan would have serious negative consequences to the quality of life of the people and dogs that these parks are supposed to serve.

Organization:

Commenter: Cynthia Cook **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3953 **Comment Id:** 360130 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Z **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3958 **Comment Id:** 360187 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: 50% o SF households have a dog and restricting us to such a small area will not allow me to exercise and play with my dog for his health, and mine, in a way that is enjoyable for us

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Tausend **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4509 **Comment Id:** 360454 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have a dog who helps me through my medical issues and having no space to share with him where he can run and be happy, socializing with people and animals, is not a fair and equitable situation for the many tax paying dog lovers in our cities.

Organization:

Commenter: Austen Eddy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4529 **Comment Id:** 360481 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you continue to push dog owners in to smaller and smaller off-leash locations several things will likely happen. First, as your force the concentration of dogs to higher and higher numbers in these areas, the negative repercussions will increase. To limit damage by dogs and high foot traffic, INCREASING the space available thereby decreasing the concentration of foot traffic will minimize damage. You are doing the exact wrong thing to protect people and the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4533 **Comment Id:** 360488 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having safe off-leash areas for our four-legged companions is crucial to this city. Such areas draw people to SF, and allow recreational activities that happen to be enjoyed by people and their pets. Please understand how life-changing it would be to so many SF residents that it would significantly lower the quality of life for many.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4535 **Comment Id:** 360490 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not change the amount of open and off leash space. It would decrease or almost eliminate something that enriches my life and my dogs' lives so much. We utilize these open spaces for socialization and exercise every week.
Organization:
Commenter: Jessica M Stanton **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4058 **Comment Id:** 360583 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: A second argument referencing the needs for children (under 18 years of age), and elderly (60 years of age and older), or disadvantaged in any way whatsoever, should be foremost when weighing preferences or "needs" of those responsible for dogs in public spaces.
Organization: WILLIAM HAMMOND HALL SOCIETY
Commenter: Barton Mayhew **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4604 **Comment Id:** 361131 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking a dog in the beautiful outdoors is a healthy activity for pets and their owners. It is part of the daily routine for many dog owners, who gather so their dogs can play together and meet both social and physical needs.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathy N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4626 **Comment Id:** 361146 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks 3-4 times a week with my dog, Dante, at Ocean Beach I think your plan for the GGNRA is wrong. It prevents both my dog, my girlfriend and myself from getting much needed exercise, the way we have since we got our dog. Before we got him we barely got out.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Ageno **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4635 **Comment Id:** 361152 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is so important for the mental health of both dogs and their companions. To take away this opportunity for people and their companions will have detrimental health effects that are bad for both the dogs and their humans. I often suggest that women get dogs to walk

with for their health for safety and companionship to get them outside and moving.

Organization:

Commenter: Penelope J Fetsch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4644 **Comment Id:** 361165 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: John Delaplane **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4693 **Comment Id:** 361343 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, off-leash dogs near playgrounds can be dangerous to our small, toddling children and I believe a safe-distance perimeter would be helpful so children can also enjoy the grassy areas and not be in fear of getting knocked over by a dog chasing a ball.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4731 **Comment Id:** 361405 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What I do know if that if this plan goes through and dogs do not get exercise and then flood the small parks we can expect the following; more bites and injuries for dogs and humans, increased euthanasia, more dogs begin abandoned at the shelter, decreased health benefits for people that cannot safely walk their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: caroline beeler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4771 **Comment Id:** 361486 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, you also are very aware that small, fenced dog runs are very dangerous for most dogs, and only open park areas - where dogs can easily be distant from dangerous people (and other hazards) are safe. Removing the ONLY open parkland from use by families with dogs puts all dogs in San Francisco in danger.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Weinberger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4778 **Comment Id:** 361511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Dog Management Plan to further restrict areas where dogs are currently permitted in the GGNRA will discourage people from 1) exercising in these beautiful areas, and 2) will cause people to be less supportive of maintaining these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: T B **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4785 **Comment Id:** 361524 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It will prevent me and the thousands of other responsible people who enjoy recreating with their dogs in the GGNRA from doing so, thus negatively impacting our own mental and physical health and the health of our dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Laurie Berk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4790 **Comment Id:** 361536 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to express the strongest possible opposition to the new GGNRAs draft dog management plan. I have lived in SF with dogs for more than 25 years, and I exercise my dogs in different parts of the GGNRA on a daily basis. The new plan is draconic, needlessly restrictive, and will make it incredibly difficult for me and my dogs to exercise and enjoy the outdoors as we have been doing for over two decades.

Organization:

Commenter: Glen Kretmar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4795 **Comment Id:** 361548 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Being able to exercise in a natural area with their dog off leash provides a vital benefit both physically and mentally for people and their dogs. If off leash dog walking is restricted many of these people will no longer be able to get this benefit.

Organization:

Commenter: Kenji Okamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4799 **Comment Id:** 361557 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A large population of cooped up dogs is good for no one. Unable to socialize and exercise, bad things are more likely to happen than good. Once that happens, I worry the dog owners will also be blamed.

Organization:

Commenter: Ben Dutro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4824 **Comment Id:** 361601 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a woman I greatly enjoy the peace of mind of being able to hike solo on trails with a dog by my side. This is one of my most treasured activities. Without my dog along I do not feel comfortable alone on hikes, and I know there have been cases of women being harassed and attacked on trials. Limiting dog friendly trials even further also limits my own access and enjoyment of the outdoors.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4840 **Comment Id:** 361618 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a resident of San Francisco's Lower Pacific Heights for the past 14 years, and a dog-owner for the past 9, I am writing to strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4872 **Comment Id:** 361666 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Table 5 shows that over an 11 year period, there were a total of 4,932 reported dog-related incidents out of a total of 45,700 total incidents over this period. This is approximately 11 percent of total incidents and averages about 450 per year. Figure 5 presents the annual visitation to the GGNRA from 1973 to 2011. Looking at years 2001 - 2011, visitation at the GGNRA is approximately 14.5 million visitors per year. This equates to about 3 dog incidents per 100,000 visitors per year or 0.003 percent per year. This is substantially less than approximate 1-2 percent of dog incidents in the United States (Centers for Disease Control and US Census Bureau). Dog-related incident data for the 11 year period for on- and off-leash dogs at GGNRA, which is especially dog-friendly, shows that these incidents are substantially less than national averages.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynne Srinivasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4874 **Comment Id:** 361675 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are family and they need to exercise and socialize in open, safe and large areas. Restricting exercise and socialization to limited contained spaces will increase the risk of dog fights and make those areas unfit for good use due to the shear volume of dogs in one area.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4882 **Comment Id:** 361687 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting off-leash activities to small defined areas causes many problems, including dog fights since the pooches lack adequate personal space. In addition, small "dog parks" generally force needless congestion causing excessive terrain damage due to non-dispersed foot and paw traffic.
Organization:
Commenter: Kurt N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4883 **Comment Id:** 361698 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Law enforcement issues are minor. As the Park Service well knows, the number of dog-related incidents is extremely low, with reports showing a total of six dog bites throughout the entire GGNRA during 2013, among hundreds of thousands of visitors. While a dog bite is a serious matter regardless of how few occur, the Park Service currently has the authority to restrict dogs that do not respond to voice command. Furthermore, a leash is no guarantee that a dangerous dog will not bite a stranger.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard Springwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4944 **Comment Id:** 361804 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have read the report carefully, and I have not found any evidence in the report that shows the planned change in policy will reduce the number of dog bites. Does the park service have any statistical data reporting the incidence of dog bites for the two scenarios being compared (present rules or revised rules)? Without such data, I don't believe that there is a reasonable basis for expecting the proposed policy change to reduce the incidence of dog bites.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4945 **Comment Id:** 361808 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It would also force large numbers of dogs into the small, already crowded city parks to try to exercise. We know that problems occur when too many dogs/people are crowded into too small a space.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4961 **Comment Id:** 361847 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In this addendum, I would like to reiterate the importance of ensuring all dogs that use GGNRA are licensed in the owners' county of residence. This is a very important from a public and canine health and safety perspective.It is important because licensing helps to prevent the transmission of disease and rabies from dog to people and from dog to dog. A dog can only receive its annual license if it has received certain inoculations such as rabies. Assuming the dog's license is current; if the licensed dog were to bite a person, the transmission of rabies would be non- existent.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A Rowinski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361913 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If the claim of dogs compromising visitor safety were true, then there proposal should reflect such impact. In other words, why would they allow dogs to be in the areas of Ocean Beach that are more highly populated with humans. If this claim were justified then they should allow dogs to be where most humans are not. Yet their proposal restricts the areas of Ocean Beach to the areas where there is easy access, parking lots and known use by the majority of those that visit the beach. Why place the highest population of people in close proximity to the one thing they claim is compromising their safety?

Organization:

Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361987 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Regarding safety, the plan states that the cumulative impacts for Alternative A are the same as for Alternative F: Negligible. To conclude, page 1085, Muir Beach receives heavy visitation by beachgoers and walkers on the weekends and moderate to high use on the weekdays. Overall, the number of leash law violations is low for this site, with only nine occurring in 2008 through 2011; no dog bites or attacks were reported during this period (table 9). So why the concern over safety?

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361988 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have concern over being on trails without my dogs and feeling unsafe due to predators, both animal and human.

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5044 **Comment Id:** 362108 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am for off leash areas for dogs because it gives my dog appropriate space and atmosphere to socialize. When on leash my dog is more defensive and less susceptibility to have 100% psitive interactions. He has NEVER had a negative experience with another dog off leash at fort funston. Without these areas I believe that there will be higher aggression rates
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5075 **Comment Id:** 362156 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If dogs are restricted from running and socializing and getting their energy out, they can go stir crazy and their frustration can make everyone around them sad and frustrated too. I think that the risk is great that the issues some people have with dogs will get worse if they are unable to get the proper exercise they need.
Organization:
Commenter: Z Meherali **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5106 **Comment Id:** 362189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Tara A Medve **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5110 **Comment Id:** 362193 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Small, fenced dog runs are very dangerous for most dogs, and only open park areas - where dogs can easily be distant from dangerous people (and other hazards) are safe. Removing the ONLY open parkland from use by families with dogs puts all San Franciscans - human and canine - in danger.
Organization:
Commenter: Lauren Hauptman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4224 **Comment Id:** 362232 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Also from the Fort Funston analysis "Impacts to health and safety would be

long-term, moderate to major, and adverse for the noaction alternative, long-term, minor to moderate, adverse for alternatives C, D, E, and the preferred alternative F, and long-term, minor, and adverse for alternative B." It is common knowledge that Fort Funston was a hang-out for drug use and sales prior to it becoming popular for dog walkers. As anyone knows who has significant experience at Fort Funston, this is an overstatement and is not supported by the analysis.

Organization:

Commenter: G K Webb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4249 **Comment Id:** 362321 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: For all of the GGNRA, this data amounts to a total of 2 dog bites each month, or only about 25 each year. Elsewhere, the report states that there are 4.5 million dog bites throughout the US each year (more than one dog bite for every 100 citizens). For comparison, the GGNRA is immersed in San Francisco, with a population of almost 1 million, represents 1 in 300 of the of the average US population. If the average incidence of dog bites in San Francisco was an appropriate fraction of the 4.5M bites in the US every year, we would be suffering more than 15,000 dog bites per year in San Francisco. If only 25 of the 15,000 dog bites suffered in and around San Francisco were taking place within the GGNRA, the data suggests that these environments are actually much safer for people than other places in the city and in the US. In this report, the occurrence of 95 dog bites in 4 years is cited many times as evidence of a need for a change in policy. I actually think this data indicates that THE PRESENT POLICY IS EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE at minimizing dog bites. I see no evidence suggesting that a change is needed. Furthermore, this lengthy report provides no data comparing parks with comparable numbers of visitors and different dog-walking policies to prove that the proposed policies will have the desired impact on the incidence of dog-related attacks. Instead of using evidence, the report makes an argument, based solely on the report of 96 dog bites in 4 years that a change in policy is needed. Then, the GGNRA proposes a specific set of policy changes that, according to their own data, seems likely to increase the number of attacks and bites.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4269 **Comment Id:** 362342 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: am writing to support the new policy to restrict off-leash dog walking. The behavior of dogs at GGNRA beaches is not only disruptive to the enjoyment of the area but is also threatening and potentially hazardous to people, especially children.

Organization:

Commenter: Harold Ball **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4289 **Comment Id:** 362357 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Use of the open space is critical to the health and well being of my dogs and my family - small backyards which are common in CA are prohibitive to exercise and walking on the street doesn't provide the same amount of exercise, pleasure or safety measures for the dogs or the people walking the dogs. Rancho Corral provides the perfect opportunity for dogs and their owners to get the exercise they need in a safe environment. It also allows for social interaction for owners and their dogs which is critical to the mental well being of both. We have met such wonderful people and neighbors through walking our dogs at Rancho which has enhanced our day to day living and allowed us to feel safe and secure in our community. All of this is truly invaluable.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5227 **Comment Id:** 362713 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If there is a problem with dogs within the GGNRA, the NPS dog incident data should contain a record of the issues. Between 2001 and 2011, the GGNRA recorded 4,932 dog-related incidents, or 448/year or less than two per day across all 80,000 acres and 24 dog sites in the GGNRA. The GGNRA sees over 13,000,000 visitors per year and yet only records 448 incidents per year. This is hardly indicative of a problem, and in fact proves that the 1979 Pet Policy works.

Organization:

Commenter: David Nielsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5273 **Comment Id:** 362851 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: By significantly reducing the off-leash dog areas, we will undoubtedly over time see an increase in aggressive dog behavior. Dogs need to be exercised, and more importantly, well socialized. The off leash dog parks allow for this to occur.

Organization:

Commenter: Lori Pryt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362861 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not demonstrate that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. It states that in the last year, out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher which reveals that these dog-related incidents are negligible and do not support a change in management.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362862 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The FSEIS must address the impacts to visitor and recreationalist safety from the NPS's proposals to crowd dogs into smaller spaces surrounded by fences.
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362863 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm very disturbed to see that leashes are still being proposed for the sand ladder at Fort Funston. I raised this serious safety concern at the DEIS stage and it has not been corrected in the SEIS. Footing is very difficult to keep walking down the unmaintained sand ladder, which is sometimes composed of stair logs in the air, with the sand underneath having eroded away. The stair then moves when one steps on it, and having a dog pulling on a leash will surely result in falls and injuries. I have found it hard to keep footing just walking without a leashed dog in this location.
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5291 **Comment Id:** 362895 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 30 years.
Organization:
Commenter: Natala Menezes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5294 **Comment Id:** 362907 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason and Fort Funston for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Anna Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5303 **Comment Id:** 362926 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The alternative plans offered for on and off lead dog areas are at best disingenuous, and at worst dangerous. You provide a range of concepts from near total prohibition to such restrictive ideas that at their best restrict and confine the current numbers of dog owners now frequenting the open space into tight concentrations of such high density that issues of sanitation, overcrowding of trails, canine territorial disputes, and most simply put, a miserable environment that discourages access.

Organization:

Commenter: Dan Kaljian **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5349 **Comment Id:** 363000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is critical to the emotional and physical health of dogs to be able to exercise fully. This is rarely possible on leash or in small postage stamp sized "dog areas" If dogs are not given adequate exercise they are prone to more physical health problems. More importantly they often exhibit more behavior problems that affect people. As a veterinarian of 30 years I can tell you that dogs that need exercise and do not get it are more likely to have aggression related issues, including dog bites. I am concerned that if you do you not continue to provide space for dogs to run you will see an increase in the incidence of dog related problems.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Bouchard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5427 **Comment Id:** 363213 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I exercise my dog on Crissy Field/Fort Mason and Ocean Beach daily and our walker takes her to Baker Beach and Fort Funston. There would be very few places in the city where she (and I) would get sufficient exercise if this plan were implemented, and roaming the beaches and parks is one of the reasons I love living in San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Anna Fabiano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5431 **Comment Id:** 363221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: They have to take their dogs somewhere to exercise them. I foresee many, many people using areas such as small city parks to run their dogs; areas where dogs have either always been banned or only allowed on-leash. Perhaps the powers that be see this as a new revenue source for issuing tickets to such offenders? I also see many more aggressive dog issues as people are forced to use smaller, congested designated dog parks; areas that are frequently used by owners that are either ignorant of the need, or are just too lazy to provide proper supervision

Organization:

Commenter: Stef Meinhardt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5443 **Comment Id:** 363268 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I strongly oppose the preferred alternative in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I regularly take my dog to Crissy Field and other GGNRA areas. My dog Olive loves to run and play fetch off leash. She is very well behaved and responsive to verbal commands, so is never in danger of harming off-trail wildlife. Depriving her of and I of this activity is a major blow to each of us and our respective physical and mental health.
Organization:
Commenter: Lauren T Gehman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5474 **Comment Id:** 363337 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Our dogs need "off leash" exercise for everyone's sanity and safety. If they don't get it you will probably see a rise in biting incidents. Because dogs, like humans, get a little loopy without running. Please do not lessen our ability to exercise our dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Robert Ficarro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5522 **Comment Id:** 363896 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The majority of dog behavioral issues stem from lack of exercise. Banning the ability for a dog to run free, off-leash WILL increase the number of aggressive dogs who are unstable. These animals will be more likely to bite children and other dogs, among other issues.
Organization:
Commenter: Julie N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5560 **Comment Id:** 363944 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please please NO NOT LET THIS MEASURE GO THROUGH. I feel it will negatively effect the lives of so many. I am a responsible dog owner who cleans up after my dogs, is respectful of others, and derives great joy and health from romping on the beach with my mutts. Please do not stifle this crucial source of health and enjoyment for myself and thousands of others.
Organization:
Commenter: john p whitty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5605 **Comment Id:** 363996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to

express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Kali Kraum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5631 **Comment Id:** 364038 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: MCL also agrees with Alternative F's general approach to trails in the Marin Headlands, which is to allow on-leash dog access on the perimeter of the area, while protecting the integrity of wild inner portions frequented by coyote, bobcat, and other wildlife with large territories and need of protections. This approach safety also enhances visitor safety.

Organization: Marin Conservation League

Commenter: Jon Elam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5634 **Comment Id:** 364052 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The site should continue as it is. as a dog park to take our dogs to walk,play and socialize, on or off leash, throughout the park without proposed limitations. Today, it is rare that I see folks behaving badly, and I believe that the use of the park as is, and if it were able to continue as is, would actually be an asset to the site at Fort Funston, as well as the other sites. If it were to be changed as proposed, I believe there would be less visitors to the site, since most of the visitors are dog owners/walkers, and crime would likely return and become the problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth F Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5659 **Comment Id:** 364088 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog owners who live in the densely populated city will have nowhere to go. There are very few open areas. When these become too crowded, dogs get nervous and accidents occur.

Organization:

Commenter: elizabeth cavagnaro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5698 **Comment Id:** 364162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover,

this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Carly M Braak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5698 **Comment Id:** 364164 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe we'd see a huge increase in reported incidents if all the dogs in this city don't have a place to workout off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Carly M Braak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5728 **Comment Id:** 364192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreational activity with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years

Organization:

Commenter: Kelly M Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5741 **Comment Id:** 364220 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there were only a few actual incidents including: only 6 dog bites report, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. There were 2 additional incidents reported where "people were scared." Taken in context of the hundreds of thousands of dog visits to the GGNRA, this data does not support the requested need for a change. Further, the data most certainaly does not justify the funding request for $2M to fund more park rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Hugh McDermott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5752 **Comment Id:** 364237 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I ask that you consider the data released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. I don't feel that data supports the requested needs for a change.

Organization:

Commenter: Diego E Castaneda **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5785 **Comment Id:** 364299 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Nothing better than allowing you and your dog to run free in these selected areas of San Francisco. I so enjoy meeting and talking to other dog owners. We are happy there which creates a happy vibe which means we treat the areas well! Please don't do this to us ~ we need the wide open spaces for our health and our doggies health!!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5797 **Comment Id:** 364318 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When you look at the GGNRA's own statistics and consider the hundreds of thousands of dog visits annually at Fort Funston, the number of problem dog incidents is astoundingly low. This should be a case of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" instead of throwing $2 million at a bogus problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364479 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The most recent data (2012-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been very few negative incidents involving dogs as compared to the many more reported negative incidents involving people. This data therefore does not support the request or the need for a change as proposed in the draft dog management plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364481 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I used to also frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command, less now, because they are too crowded, my dog feels more tense, there's not enough room to exercise, and they cause more stress to both me and my dog, rather than relaxation.

Organization:

Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5893 **Comment Id:** 364487 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Schnobrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5889 **Comment Id:** 364521 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In terms of the incidents that sometimes occur, the sparse documentation provided vis-ï¿½-vis the incidents reports in the document imply less than one dog-related incident per 20,000 to 30,000 visits. Not bad. People dont behave that well in shopping malls. As to the environmental issues, the case for any serious consequences has not been made.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5922 **Comment Id:** 364642 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Taking Ft. Funston away from us as dog owners would mean squeezing hundreds more dogs into city parks which has already shown to create stress for the dogs and owners resulting in more fights between dogs AND owners because of confined space and lack of room to run and be free.

Organization:

Commenter: Steve J Baechtle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5957 **Comment Id:** 364786 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I wish to formally and firmly oppose the new GGNRA draft dog management plan. I am a frequent user of local park areas with my dog, who is always well behaved, and who I always clean up after. These outdoor recreational areas are what makes life in the city possible for my family and my dog, and it would be severely restrict our ability to happily and healthily live in this city we call home.

Organization:

Commenter: William Geddes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5975 **Comment Id:** 364845 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Without a place for my dog to run around safely, our quality of lives (and our neighbors) will plummet to an unacceptable level. Inadequate levels of exercise lead to

behavioral problems, which will ultimately disturb the peace for many San Francisco residents (barking, property destruction, etc.).

Organization:

Commenter: Laura A Kelso **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5979 **Comment Id:** 364847 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Even more wonderful for the dog and the dog owner is watching dogs play off leash. Dogs need to be socialized as they are pack animals and want to be with each other. Playing together gives them exercise, enjoyment and lets off tension and stress, just like it does for humans. Fort Funston is a treasure for dogs to romp and play and has been for decades now. I have taken my dogs and friends dogs to this place and never have I seen problems with playing and getting along

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Cappa **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4418 **Comment Id:** 365164 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily excludes the Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their canine companions. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.

Organization:

Commenter: Carol Schlesinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6068 **Comment Id:** 365296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For this reason, I am writing to express my significant opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It restricts the area to off leash dog walking way too strictly and will have detrimental effects on both my health and that of my dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Kiley M Nichols **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365367 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Claims by Mr. Dean himself that dog-related incidents are the largest percentage of complaints received by the GGNRA are not supported by either the data provided in the DEIS or SEIS, or by the the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA. Out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs last year alone, there have only been 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife

killing, and 1 horse bite incident documented. However, the reported incidents involving people are much higher.

Organization:

Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6082 **Comment Id:** 365378 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This plan isn't reasonable. Our dogs need space to run. This plan will only cause angry conflicts in parks where people should be doing healthy things. The people working in these areas will take the brunt of the publics' anger if this enforced. Everybody loses under this plan.

Organization: Dog owner

Commenter: Larry J Yant **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6101 **Comment Id:** 365418 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston is arguably the most popular place for dog walking and the plan to eliminate the vast majority of space for off-leash access and condense dogs into small areas is dangerous. There is no rationale and it could set up confrontations between dogs as well as people in small places. Furthermore, there is no justification for cutting off beach access between Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. Why would you want to do that? The plan cites two protected species at Fort Funston, the state threatened Bank Swallow (State) and the federally and state threatened San Francisco lessingia. However, there is no evidence that dogs or humans for that matter affect the swallow and the lessingia does not exist at Funston.

Organization:

Commenter: Dave Emanuel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6111 **Comment Id:** 365426 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I urge you to reconsider this ill-conceived plan. We are counting on you to be able to exercise both ourselves and our dog responsibly.

Organization:

Commenter: Julie S Ryan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6116 **Comment Id:** 365465 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Undocumented Assumptions - The DEIS is full of assumptions about impacts - things that might or could happen - but there is no evidence of actual observed impacts. Cannot base management plan on hypotheticals. The GGNRA has had years to observe and document actual observed impacts. The fact the GGNRA did not include them in the DEIS indicates they dont exist. Safety - DEIS claims a major safety problem with dogs in the GGNRA. But their own

data indicates dogs accounted for only 2% o serious safety incidents involved dogs. The vast majority of serious incidents involved people only. Even if you include non-serious incidents, dogs accounted for a mere 7% o incidents in the GGNRA. Dogs are not a major safety problem.

Organization:

Commenter: SUSAN OBAYASHI **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6123 **Comment Id:** 365493 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Celene Matthews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365500 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is an inherent conflict between "minimizing conflicts" and "including areas where dogs are allowed", and the report says nothing about how these conflicting goals are weighted or balanced. At present, the number of conflicts is exceedingly low (only 95 reports in 4 years, compared against 4.5 million incidents nationwide), and the present arrangement provides for a tremendous quantity of high-value experiences, as any visitor to the GGNRA can plainly see. The proposed plans will dramatically curtail experiences related to dog walking while providing no obvious reduction in the number of dog-attacks. Therefore, I do not believe that this objective is met by any of the new proposals, and is in fact, worsened by each of them.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6316 **Comment Id:** 365505 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I will not be able to get the exercise I need either if the leash law is enforced. I depend on that precious hour in the park every morning to get my exercise with my dogs. I don't have any other time to work out, and if I have to choose, then I will be walking my dogs on-leash in the street rather than spending that hour in a gym without them.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura Hansen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6131 **Comment Id:** 365526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I recognize the difficulty in trying to please so many diverse user groups. However, as a dog owner, I do not support the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.

It will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Raimondo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6142 **Comment Id:** 365608 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS data still do not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. Between 2008 to 2011 it reports 95 dog bites. That's a minuscule number considering the tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of dog walks that must have taken place within the GGNRA during those four years.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert A Dewey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6155 **Comment Id:** 365650 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Per the latest data released by the GGNRA, the claim that dog-related incidents are the largest percentage of complaints received is false. Out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs last year alone, there have only been 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident documented (2012-2013 report). However, the incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the reported necessity for any change in policy for improved public safety or visitor experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim M **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6178 **Comment Id:** 365757 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I carefully read the section of the report from pages 252-258, which describes many of the reported dog-related incidents. Over a 10-year period, there are reports of about 4000 events, which averages to 400/year or about 30 each month - roughly one each day. This sounds terrible, but there is no data offered for comparison. What is the incidence of dog-related incidents in a comparably-sized park with comparable volume of visitors, and dogs either not allowed or only allowed on leash? Is it much lower, the same, or much higher? Without any comparative analysis, this data is absolutely meaningless, and is not useful as a basis for a massive change in policy. If the NPS wants to impose a policy change on the GGNRA, and wants to offer data to support this change, the NPS should offer enough data to show that the policy change will have the intended effect. This data does not indicate anything useful about the proposed policy change.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6358 **Comment Id:** 365798 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It is critical that Fort Funston continue to allow off-leash dog walking on the paved pathways. In addition to the benefits to visitors, including the elderly and disabled, there is a real risk associated with requiring leashes in the constricted pathways, with tangled leashes around people's feet and ankles, risking falls and rope burns. These are neither trivial nor merely theoretical concerns; as a physician I have seen both kinds of injuries from dog leashes more than once, as well as other orthopedic injuries associated with the use of leashes. It appears to actually be safer in many respects for dogs to be off-leash when circumstances allow. The very fact that the current de facto off-leash dog walking protocol at Draft Dog Management Plan has continued without noticeable incident during our very frequent visits indicates that this situation does not need to be restricted.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6390 **Comment Id:** 365826 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Secondly, at Fort Funston, you have chosen to require leashes on the sand ladder and on the path from beach to trail on the north end of the beach. Have you ever walked with a dog on a leash up or down either or those? THIS WILL SET THIS UP FOR FAILURE AS THE ELDERLY OR ANYONE WHO HAS A DOG OVER 20 LBS WHO PULLS ON THE LEASH (AS ALL DOGS CAN DO) COULD DESTABILIZE THE PERSON AND CAUSE INJURY.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6200 **Comment Id:** 366000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For the years from 2008 to 2011, in most cases, there has been a steady and significant downward trend in the number of these incidents. For example, at Crissy Field, the number of incidents falls from almost 200 to much less than 100, including a dramatic reduction in the incidents of dogs in the WPA. These reductions have come about because of increased efforts at education, as well as self-policing of these areas. On the basis of this data, I believe the present policy is working, and that some additional investment in education would produce significant benefits. In contrast, the report gives no evidence to show that the proposed policy changes will have beneficial effects, or that the presence of the proposed policies in other comparable urban park settings has had these benefits.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6209 **Comment Id:** 366122 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a frequent visitor and future resident of Montara, I oppose the proposed 'Regulated Off Leash Area' (ROLA) in the area between Le Conte St. and Tamarind St., Montara in the Rancho Corral de Tierra area of the GGNRA. Reference Alternative 'C' and 'E' of the GGNRA draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)." Some reasons to oppose the 'dog park' in this area: - Preserve / conserve the open space - The operation of the adjacent school and student safety will be adversely impacted - The streets accessing the area are not suited to additional traffic - The existing quiet neighborhood will be degraded by noise and traffic A fenced off-leash area directly adjacent to a residential community will be unsightly - dog excrement will accumulate despite best efforts by owners to cleanup. This is not only unsightly, but a potential public health hazard where dog parasites can contaminate the soil. Urine and fecal matter accumulation will smell and will ruin grass and topsoil. Barking and yelping will contribute to noise pollution.

Organization:

Commenter: Ellis Tobin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6221 **Comment Id:** 366142 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Ours and all dogs need plenty of space to run off leash. Countless reasons that are stated to support maintaining the off leash trails and beaches. To maintain good health dogs need to run hard and the most effective way to run is off leash. Please consider the behavior that may result when our well exercised dogs are denied their rift to run free.....possible bad behavior which may include aggressiveness.

Organization:

Commenter: Louise Selin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6222 **Comment Id:** 366145 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe dogs should be able to roam in parks to remain strong and healthy. If dogs don't get the energy that their bodies require, it can lead to behavior issues. In conclusion, if parks and trails no longer let dogs roam and get the exercise that their bodies need, it can result in aggressive behavior, unhealthiness, and most importantly unhappiness. If dogs can roam free, these things have a better chance of not occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Laila C LoRe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6240 **Comment Id:** 366163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If we are limited to one small area, I will be forced to simply watch my dog play, instead of getting exercise with her. I have many, many friends and neighbors who feel the same way. Unfortunately, living in a densely populated city, this is the only way for me and my dog to get great exercise and enjoy time together.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicole D H **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6246 **Comment Id:** 366189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I begin with the public health impact. Every owner knows "a tired dog is a happy dog," and many people like me are urban residents who rely on these GGNRA areas to give ourselves and our dogs the daily exercise they require for our physical and mental health and socialization. Your Plan would impose an undue burden on SF dog owners for whom daily commuting to some remote rural location to allow their dogs to run freely while under voice control would be prohibitive. Dog ownership helps promote the public health and well-being, and the GGNRA serves as an important resource for Bay Area residents with and without dogs in this context, especially in the current areas where off leash walking is permitted.
Organization:
Commenter: Rhonda Vitanye **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366221 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The report continually treats as fact the idea that dog waste contaminates soil and water and poses a threat to human health but provides no data to support this. It would not require a tremendous amount of resources to test samples for microbes commonly found in dog waste, but I suspect the GGNRA fears the results would not support their conclusions.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366226 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS also emphasizes the incidence of hazardous interactions between dogs and people in the GGNRA. No one would suggest that these incidences are not serious, but the report implies they are the norm rather than an extremely rare event. Although this information is not presented side-by-side in the report, by gathering data from separate sections of the SEIS, I estimate that there were ~140 hazardous dog citations over four years (2008-2011) in all GGNRA lands out of ~2000 total dog incidences in the same period, or less than 10%. were 95 documented dog bites in all of the GGNRA during those four years or approximately 24 per year. The GGNRA estimates 15 million visitors every year and estimating that ~20% o those visitors are accompanied by a dog (3 million), that puts the rate of dog bites at 0.000008%. put into this context, the threat from dangerous or aggressive dogs is vanishingly small and does not justify the disproportionate focus of the SEIS.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6405 **Comment Id:** 366261 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The proposed change in limiting off leash areas which dog owners have come enjoy for years is dramatic and harsh to dog owners. This will force more dog owners into smaller more concentrated areas which creates an unhealthy environment for all concerned.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366946 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Alternative F does not adequately address safety concerns for visitors and dogs on the Fort Point Promenade, which is between the edge of a heavily used roadway and the edge of the seawall, and on trails in the Fort Point area that are heavily used by visitors and can be congested. Even with the current requirement that dogs be kept on leash, during my visits to the area, I noticed a number of dogs off-leash. Please adopt Alternative D in order to better reduce the potential for conflicts among users and the possibility of interactions with aggressive dogs and compromised visitor and dog safety.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6420 **Comment Id:** 366981 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: At Fort Mason, the area has long been used for dog walking, both on leash and off. It is a convenient location for many SF residents who need to walk and recreate with their dogs before and after work. In order to separate the dog walkers, you have set aside the green space on the corner of Bay Street across from Safeway for off-leash walking. This land slopes directly into the street! If dogs are allowed to play here off-leash there will surely be balls and dogs going into the busy street, which would be disaster. I imagine the only way to rectify this would be to build a very tall, expensive and unwanted fence. This will block views and destroy the open space San Francisco have enjoyed for a very long time.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6609 **Comment Id:** 367174 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm highly concerned about the proposed leash-only areas and am wondering what the ramifications will be? How many altercations will ensue? How crowded will the off-leash parks around me become? Whan about parking? How will my dog get her exercise? How will I get my exercise? The questions are endless. The reasons to pass the plan are few and unproven.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Schulting **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6612 **Comment Id:** 367189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting off 'leash areas will increase pressure on dogs which I believe it will be detrimental to safety similar to the impact that dog parks have when there are too many dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Alice Sakamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6623 **Comment Id:** 367480 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: By severely restricting dogs to ever smaller areas, it becomes a self fulfilling prophecy that there will be problems. You put more pressure on the dogs to interact in smaller spaces. People who love their dogs will drive as far as they need to for off leash areas. By limiting people in Marin and San Francisco you force them to converge on areas where off leash use is allowed. More dogs in smaller spaces will lead to more conflict.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Eshman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6435 **Comment Id:** 367489 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: What I can predict from the legislation and reduced areas of off leash access is many folded. Smaller dog areas and more ON-leash requirements will escalate the number of dog fights especially in a group setting. The familiar "flight or fight" response: Dogs who will feel threatened or scared and can not create space to make them selves safe will have to fight because they have no choice. Which will inevitably result in more dog on dog and dog on human altercations which will only reinforce the nay-sayers who were against dogs all along.
Organization:
Commenter: Natalie Tondelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6630 **Comment Id:** 367508 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I take my dog, who is well behaved, to Crissy Field, Fort Funston Ocean Beach to run. If he had to be leased neither of us would get people exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: Francine Fillice **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6472 **Comment Id:** 367525 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: With the current state of no enforcement at the parks, it is obvious that individuals will do as they please unless someone with a badge is immediately ready to ticket them. If you plan to enforce the new regulations, you will only be cramming the same number of off leash users into a smaller area, which will only increase the number of public safety issues as

off leash dogs need plenty of space from each other to ease social tension.
Organization: The Domestic Animal
Commenter: Shannon Bolt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: These proposed restrictions (only 7 of the 22 areas proposed would allow dog walking access on GGNRA lands in all three counties), in turn, will likely increase user conflict because of the limited remaining space for dog recreation. For example, the proposal to have dogs on leashes at places like Baker Beach or Muir Beach will simply not work and is unrealitisic. And there is no factual or scientific basis in closing off leash dog walking at East Beach or the Grassy Airfield at Crissy Field nor at any of the areas under consideration. What dog can you take to the beach and not have them romp and have fun? Dogs and people need socialization for a healthy and happy lifestyle.
Organization:
Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367536 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: A fact to consider: in the year 2012 to 2013, (data I received from a GGNRA staffer) out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs; there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. While I am troubled that these dog-related incidents occurred and want to prevent any type of further dog incidents, I believe that expanding the San Francisco SPCAs Off Leash Open Space dog-training class would help to reduce such dog related incidents in the future. Also, it is my understanding the human incidents rate in the GGNRA for the same time period is much, much higher. This data does not support a need for change to further restrict off leash dog walking.
Organization:
Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6637 **Comment Id:** 367562 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm now 80 years old, still active, and walking my dogs off leash, as I have for the past 40 or so years. My health and mental well being are in your hands.
Organization:
Commenter: Mort S Gensberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6510 **Comment Id:** 367624 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: . It seems to be the assumption in the SEIS that conflict disappears with the

proposed plan; that under the current rule there is conflict, but when you drastically reduce the area we're permitted in, conflict disappears. This makes no sense

Organization: Fort Funston Dog Walkers

Commenter: Linda F McKay **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6518 **Comment Id:** 367652 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Social and Economic Impacts: The SEIS did not address the social and health benefits of dog walking. Cities are advertising how dog friendly they are, Mendocino and Carmel for example. How will these restrictions effect tourism? People with their dogs who come from other parts of the Bay Area may not come as often and will not be spending money at local restaurants and shops.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Stafford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367984 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The severe truncation of space and opportunity reflected in the GGNRA "preferred alternative" sends the wrong message regarding exercise, and regarding off-leash recreation. The GGNRA is failing to capitalize on the opportunity to recognize and support the value of walking ones dog as a means of maintaining fitness and improving health in an incremental, continuous and positive manner. With its present Pet Policy, the GGNRA is on the cutting edge of demonstrating and providing a venue for lifelong recreation and a multi-generational healthy life style. The GGNRA should be a model for healthy exercise in an urban setting, positive treatment of pets, and the creation of community in an urban context. This is a model to be celebrated and replicated, not destroyed.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However, the planned reduction of space which will corral the dogs and their owners into a tenth of the one percent of land now available, and the requirement to walk dogs only on-leash on trails will create a dangerous situation for both owners and dogs. (4) In a recreational use survey of Fort Funston carried out in 2000, it was noted that Fort Funston alone accommodates more than five percent of GGNRA visitors, but comprises less than 0.3 percent of GGNRA acreage. (5) The reduction of space and access proposed by the Dog Management Plan is unnecessary and untenable, will lay the foundation for negative behavior and territoriality, and will destroy what is now a viable, valuable, and beloved national recreational resource.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 368001 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The one place where the SEIS found some hard data was in relation to "dog incidents" in the GGNRA. In the four years from 2008 to 2011, with the hundreds of thousands of people and dog visits to the GGNRA, most of the dog incidents reported had to do with leash law violations. In this entire period, there were only 95 cases of dog bites or attacks. (17) In contrast to this, over that same period, 89% of the reported safety incidents had nothing to do with dogs, and they included murder, larceny, rape, robbery and drugs. The GGNRA should begin to realize that their safest areas are those where the dogs are, as is the case also in city areas where people walk with their dogs. It would be nice to know the number of people and dogs who walk in the GGNRA, but as the GGNRA is not monitored, this data is unavailable.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368226 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRAs new draft management plan. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dogs health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6656 **Comment Id:** 368250 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the information from the GGNRA, the only data I was able to find showed that in the last year with hundreds of thousands of visits by people and dogs, only 6 dog bites were reported. The data also specified 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite. These exceedingly low numbers hardly call for a drastic change in the 1979 Pet Policy.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan M Kaplan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368266 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The EIS/SEIS both failed to establish the number of visitors to Fort Funston. As a result of the failure to establish the number of visitors per year to Fort Funston, the reports of problems with dogs (or people) cannot be evaluated. Per the SEIS, the GGNRA has between 13 million and 15 million visitors per year, yet the overall "dog related" incidents for the years 2008 through 2011 were only 2,775. 2,775 incidents versus a minimum of 52 million visitors (13 million multiplied by 4 years) is statistically insignificant. While I am sure the NPS knows the approximate number of yearly visitors to Fort Funston, it has conveniently chosen not to include

this very important information in the SEIS which prevents an accurate discussion of the impact of dog walking at Fort Funston. The 172 "dog related" incidents between 2008-2011 at Fort Funston have not been evaluated in relationship to the number of visitors to Fort Funston between 2008-2011. Therefore, the conclusion on page 221 that there are a high number of dog related incidents and conflicts affecting Human Safety has not been established.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368406 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I examined 29 incidents from the 2009 and 2010 incidents reports involving visitors being attacked by dogs. In 16 of 29 (55%) dents reviewed, the owner of the attacking dog either absconded from the victim or law enforcement or provided contact information that was bogus. This result suggest that a high proportion of visitors walking off-leash dogs are scofflaws in terms of taking responsibility for the actions of their dogs and having consideration for the other visitors affected. Visitors must realize that if attacked by a dog, it is likely that the perpetrating owner will not be identified. Visitors may have to undergo rabies shots and may not have any possibility of recovering costs associated with a serious injury. Such scofflaw behavior needs to be taken into account by GGNRA in formulating dog management regulations. It suggests that GGNRA should require that all dogs wear collars with proof of vaccination and that off-leash activity should be strictly compartmentalized withifl the Park, so that visitors wishing to minimize the risk can go elsewhere.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368426 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS presents data on dog-related incidents but does not provide a discussion of the limitations of the data and the context needed to understand and interpret data. The raw data is presented in a way that might lead one to draw conclusions about the total number of dog-related violations per year in GGNRA or to compare the number of dog walking violations and hazards between specific areas of the Park. Without information on the effort on the part of law enforcement involved in patrolling each area and the normal behavior of off-leash dog walkers, the data is just a random collection of numbers that show nothing beyond the existence of certain types of violations by dog owners in the Park. In fact, the data represents such a small sliver of the actual violations occurring that without further data it is impossible to even estimate the number and type of violations actually occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 4256 **Comment Id:** 368469 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Preferred Alternative fails to specify how visitor safety and resource protection will be achieved in the vicinity of the ROLA's. The Preferred Alternative does not describe how park visitors will be adequately informed of the ROLA boundaries, nor does it clearly ensure that off-leash dogs will be contained within the ROLA's. These shortcomings are potentials for excessive conflict.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew & JoAnn Zlatunich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6565 **Comment Id:** 368697 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The draft plan/SEIS also overlooks the commonsense fact that by severely limiting the off-leash space in the GGNRA, dog owners and their pets will be squeezed into much smaller municipal park areas of local communities, which will increase potential conflicts and negative impacts. This is also true of forcing people with dogs into much smaller areas within the GGNRA itself.

Organization:

Commenter: Shannon Yodowitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 804 **Comment Id:** 368717 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Although I agree with what is written, a reasonable review of the medical literature supports a much stronger view of the health benefits of dog ownership. I believe I have standing to offer additional information; to wit, The American Heart Association, in its peer reviewed medical journal Circulation recently (May 9, 2013) published an analysis of this issue (http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/early/2013/05/09/CIR.0b013e31829201e1.full.pdf html) entitled Pet Ownership and Cardiovascular Risk: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. They noted on page 1 that cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death in the United States. Further, obesity and physical inactivity are at epidemic proportions. They concluded on page 4 that Pet ownership, particularly dog ownership, is probably associated with decreased CVD risk (Level of Evidence: B). Level of evidence refers to the estimate of certainty or precision of the treatment effect. In order to reach a higher level of evidence, more studies would be needed and randomized studies would be required: this is problematic as it is hard to get patients to agree to being randomized into a study where they either get or do not get a dog, and further, it would be difficult to perform a blinded study as most participants would know whether or not there is a dog in their house! The American Heart Association further concluded, Pet ownership, particularly dog ownership, may have some causal role in reducing CVD risk (Level of Evidence: B). It is my professional medical opinion, as supported by the best available applicable medical literature, that dog ownership is causally related to lowering the risk of the most deadly disease in the United States of America today. Restricting available parkland that can be used for dog can reasonably be inferred to be likely to decrease exercise and pet ownership, and would likely cost lives. I humbly submit that page 35 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement should be strengthened to reflect the medical evidence that this is a matter of life and death for some visitors, and any analysis of limiting areas where dogs are to be allowed should include loss of human life as the

likely outcome of any significant restrictions. As noted on page 1226, under the heading HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY GUIDING POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

Organization:

Commenter: Dean G Kardassakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 804 **Comment Id:** 368718 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Pages 1231-2 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement concerns pathogens. It notes, Evidence shows that pets and urban wildlife can be significant bacterial sources. In the case of Fort Funston, the facts clearly show otherwise. The San Francisco Public Utillities Comission operates the Oceanside Wastewater Treatment Facility and Lake Merced. It monitors Ocean Beach and Lake Merced for bacterial contamination. The Daly City Water and Wastewater Facility monitors water quality just to the South of Fort Funston. I separately asked both of these government agencies if they had any evidence of even a single case of water contamination of any kind that has been attributed to dogs at Fort Funston since the GGNRA was established on October 27, 2013. By personal communication, both agencies could not find any evidence of dogs as a detectable source of bacterial contamination. A related issue that has been noted is that horse owners would like to be able to ride in areas apart from dogs. As a dog owner, I can from personal experience attest that dog owners frequently pick-up their pets waste material. Sadly, my experience is that horse owners do not do the same. Thus, any consideration of limiting dog access, in favor of the pleasure of equestrians, should consider the potential for worsening of this problem. The Statement also notes, Assuming compliance with the regulation, the amount of dog waste at each site should decline and would reduce the health and safety risks associated with dog-related pathogens. I challenge this assertion. It assumes by limiting dog access, the net amount of fecal material would be decreased, and unless there was a concomitant prohibition of riding, this assertion could be described as horse manure. In any case, bacterial contamination has been monitored and not found to be an issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Dean G Kardassakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1137 **Comment Id:** 368734 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Finally, if GGNRA significantly reduces the amount of space dogs have to run undoubtedly there will be more dog-dog problems as the dogs are squished into spaces that are far too small to accommodate the number of dogs using said space.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth B Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368782 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs and Pathogens 1. SEIS says: Dogs expose visitors to dangerous

pathogens. The SEIS first makes this claim on page 336, where no data or scientific studies are cited to support the claim. There is a long list of possibly, can expose, and many mays. Then a long quote from an anti-dog DEIS commenter discusses dogs run[ning] up and pee[ing] on innocent bystanders. Later, on page 1231-1232, SEIS says, Currently, adverse impacts on visitor human health and safety from dog-related pathogens exist at all park sites considered in this draft plan/SEIS. Sites such as Fort Funston&may have more of a health and safety risk from dog-related pathogens... Again, absolutely no evidence is offered of any adverse impacts on human health from dog-related pathogens at Fort Funston, or anywhere else in the GGNRA. Instead, we get the opinion of another anti-dog commenter on the DEIS: One commenter noted that multiple infections have been reported at local hospitals from bacteria transmitted from dog feces. The commenter then provides a long list of diseases he claims were transmitted by dogs. No citation is offered to any document; there is no way check the veracity of the statement. Thats not evidence of anything. So in both cases of the claim, GGNRA offers no evidence, only the un-scientific opinions of two un-identified, strongly biased, anti-dog commenters which GGNRA selects from the thousands of DEIS comments. I suppose we should be thankful that GGNRA has dropped its doubly bogus citation of a non-existent document that it used in the Draft EIS to make this unsupportable claim. Remember NPS 1999, the substudy of the San Francisco Sewage Master Plan? In fact NPS 1999 was something unrelated, and no such substudy of a sewage master plan existed. Now, without any pretense of evidence, GGNRA continues to make the claim, and relies on two biased anti-dog commenters as substitute for real evidence.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4287 **Comment Id:** 368814 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: On leash exercise limits the dog to my level of fitness, and that means that by forcing on leash requirements you are binding the exercise of many dogs to that of handicapped, and elderly owners. My dog forces me to go out every day and take a walk, and although that can be in my local neighborhood it is nothing like our walks in the Marin Headlands, or Lands End paths, or along Crissy Field.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Norton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4304 **Comment Id:** 368820 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs make our communities livable for many of us and need extensive space to run. As someone with health challenges myself, my dog walking enables me to maintain my health (a value not only for me but for my community)We need more off-leash space, not less and we need dog owners as an important voice for the value of parks and open space- not an antagonized rejected group. Please! Please! Do not allow that to happen.

Organization:

Commenter: Larry Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6536 **Comment Id:** 368842 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The policy changes will not reduce the number of dog attack incidents in the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6576 **Comment Id:** 368856 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe.
Organization:
Commenter: Kellyn Umanzor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6568 **Comment Id:** 369562 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As I have gotten older it has become more important for me to have outdoor recreational access for myself and my dogs near my home. I need to keep myself and my dogs fit in order to pursue dog agility and hiking with dogs, which activities help keep me physically healthy, mentally stimulated, and in good emotional health. And the local dog walks also keep me part of an important community of other active people with dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Linda Wilford **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6581 **Comment Id:** 369572 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Airfield at Crissy Field Your preferred alternative as regards the airfield is counter productive. The area is very large and can absorb a huge number of people with dogs without interferring with walkers and joggers on the path or people walking on the beach. By restricting the use to a small middle section, you miss an opportunity to keep dogs away from the people and resources you want to protect. In addition, there is no easy access to parking if people with dogs want to access this section of the field. I fear that people will park alongside the low buildings opposite the field and will not be able to safely unload their dogs and will have to dart across a section of Mason Street where cars drive too fast and there is no crosswalk to protect pedestrians. This is dangerous! In addition, both areas are now permitted paid parking which is expensive and prohibitive for many who want to use the park. The rest of the airfield is rarely in use by anyone but people with dogs and should be open to use. There is no sensible reason for it to be restricted. Many people park in the lot behind Sports Basement which allows free and safe unloading of dogs and well as safe crossing of Mason Street for access to the field. It makes sense to limit the section of the airfield west of the sidewalk opposite Stillwell Hall as many families using the facilities in the hangars play and picnic in this area.
Organization:

Commenter: Sally Cancelmo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6591 **Comment Id:** 369585 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Studies have shown that dog ownership increases recreational walking - supporting both recreational use of the area along with improved health benefits for the population. Another study showed that 40% of those walking/hiking in at an urban site were dog walking. Use of GGNRA lands by dog walkers is clearly a primary recreational activity.
Organization:
Commenter: Julie Speigler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6672 **Comment Id:** 369595 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I support the GGNRA's plan to ban off-lease dog walking on most of the federal lands. Many dog owners keep their dogs on-lease, however, as a senior and a walker it has been my experience that unrestrained, enthusiastic dogs are a danger to me and greatly lessen the enjoyment of walking.
Organization:
Commenter: Gail Lindlow **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369659 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In testimony before the San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare Commission on February 8, 2007, Jean Donaldson, the founder and then-director of the SF/SPCA Dog Training Academy said: Off-leash play has not proven to be a factor in dog bites. According to both the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American Veterinarian Medical Association, the majority of bites take place on the guardians property. The remaining incidents involve dogs that are either restrained, i.e., leashed, or dogs that are at large, [that is,] unsupervised dogs that have escaped confinement. Consider for example, the three highest profile serious dog attacks in the history of San Francisco. Those are Diane Whipple in 2001, Sean Jones in 2001, and Nicholas Faibish in 2005. In the first, the dogs were on-leash. In the second, the dogs had escaped confinement in the backyard and were at large. And in the third, the dog was confined in the guardians home. I would add that in all these instances, the dogs were un-neutered. Interestingly, it could very well be that the safest dogs are those that attend off-leash dog parks. Shyan and cohorts published a research paper in 2003 in the Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science which looked at the prevalence of interdog aggression in dog parks. Dog-dog problems turned out to be minimal and of a non-serious nature. While the paper did not consider the question of dog-to-human aggression, the obvious interpretation of this low incidence of aggression was interesting and I think very relevant. They suggested that self-selection operates strongly, i.e., people who take the time to get into their car or walk to a designated off-leash area to exercise their dog tend to not be the type who are derelict in other areas of dog guardianship, such as training, socialization or appropriate containment. Note: The study she referred to is: Bark Parks - A Study on Interdog Aggression in a Limited-Control

Environment, by Melissa R. Shyan, Kristina A. Fortune, and Christine King, Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science, vol. 6, no. 1, 2003 Again, I gave the GGNRA this information as part of a DEIS comment (submitted as Chair of the Animal Control and Welfare Commission), yet it was ignored. Instead the SETS chose to present information on dog bites in a sensational manner designed to convince readers of the need for restricting off-leash access to prevent dog bites.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369661 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: On pp. 253 and 254, the SETS says: In addition to obtaining the annual law enforcement incident databases from 2001 through 2011, paper copies of the dog-related law enforcement incident reports for the years 2008 through 2011 were obtained from GGNRA to conduct a more detailed analysis for each GGNRA site. ... The number of dog-related incidents in the 2008 through 2011 analysis does not match the number of incidents in the analysis of the overall law enforcement data in table 5 (which includes incidents not related to dogs) because incident reports may contain more than one violation. ... there were often multiple incident violations per incident report. This was not done for the overall law enforcement data analysis because incident reports not related to dogs did not generally include multiple violations and there was insufficient staff time available to review the approximately 40,000 incident reports not related to dogs. Essentially, the SETS assumes that non-dog-related incident reports will not contain multiple violations as the dog-related ones do. They dont know for sure, because the paragraph makes clear that they did not actually study the paper reports for non-dog related incidents. If the total number of non-dog violations is higher because of multiple violations per incident, then the percentage of dog-related incidents, compared to the total number of incidents might be even smaller than the 11% figure reported above. That the SETS did not perform this analysis of paper copies of reports for both the dog-related and non-dog-related incidents, and instead did it for just one of them, is just sloppy science. The point to keep in mind is that 89% of the incident reports in the GGNRA had nothing to do with dogs, including violent people-on-people crime. It is people who are the safety threat, not dogs. The SEIS analysis of impacts on Human Health and Safety at each site focuses on negative impacts (bites, diseases, aggression) while seeming to ignore positive benefits to human health and social community from dog walking. Thus Alternative A for Fort Funston is determined to have long-term moderate to major adverse impacts on Human Health and Safety (p. 1312) while Alternative F is determined to have long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts (p. 1318). Similar analyses are given for Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. This is a biased analysis of impacts.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369662 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS analysis of impacts on Human Health and Safety at each site focuses on negative impacts (bites, diseases, aggression) while seeming to ignore positive benefits to human health and social community from dog walking. Thus Alternative A for Fort Funston is

determined to have long-term moderate to major adverse impacts on Human Health and Safety (p. 1312) while Alternative F is determined to have long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts (p. 1318). Similar analyses are given for Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. This is a biased analysis of impacts. On p. 338, the SETS reports that a survey of guide dog handlers found that: ... a total of 83 percent of respondents had experienced interface by an aggressive dog. The majority of the attacks or interface occurred on a public-right-of-way including sidewalk and roadways. Results showed that 76 percent of dog attacks were from an off-leash dog... An off-leash dog on a sidewalk or roadway is likely to be a dog guarding its home and property or a dog that has gotten out with no owner around to control it. These circumstances are not found in the GGNRA. The more appropriate statistic would be to report the number of incidents that happened in parks like the GGNRA. The SETS contains no information on this. Therefore, this study is not particularly useful for determining risks to guide dogs in the GGNRA. Because the SEIS presents information on dog bites in a more inflammatory manner than is warranted by the facts, and its own data show that dog-related incidents are a small fraction of the incidents reported in the GGNRA, and most of those are leash law violations with no disturbance of wildlife or resource degradation, the SETS does not prove that dogs are a major problem in the GGNRA. Because it does not prove that. the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

HS4015 Health and Safety: Impacts of Dog Related Incidents (Substantive)

1. **Several commenters believe that off leash dogs are a general nuisance to wildlife, habitat, and other Golden Gate National Recreation Area visitors; however, many commenters presented details in the ways dog are a threat to the safety of others, including knocking people over, biting, growling, barking, intimidating and harassing people, and attacking other dogs and horses.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 26 **Comment Id:** 337985 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In referenced to unleashed areas in federal parks- Any area that allows dogs to be unleashed should not be patrolled by mounted park police officers. It is an accident waiting to happen to allow horses in parks designated for unleashed dogs AND dogs to be under voice control. For everyones safety,including dogs,people,mounted officers & horses,KEEP horses OUT of the parks where you allow off leashed dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Liz D Newman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 112 **Comment Id:** 345830 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: At Ocean Beach, I have been bitten by a dog running off leash. It approached me aggressively while I was jogging. I asked the owner, who was nearby, to get it under control, at which point it leapt at me and bit my arm. I still have a scar. The owner expressed zero regret and took zero responsibility. At Muir Beach, when I go there seeking peace and quiet, on a blanket off to one side, a steady parade of off-leash dogs bounds up, with no respect for the boundary of a blanket, sticking its snout in my face and/or food. Owners sometimes say "no" and the dogs sometimes respond, but there's another dog behaving like this every 5-10 minutes on weekends, making peaceful enjoyment of the beach impossible.

Organization:

Commenter: Peter Schurman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 707 **Comment Id:** 352992 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am greatly concerned about the environmental impacts of off-leash dogs roaming our natural parkland. I have witnessed off-leash dogs chasing birds and other wild animals along our beaches and trails. I have also seen off-leash dogs chase runners, jump up on children and attack other dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4694 **Comment Id:** 361346 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a dog owner but am made to feel unsafe by other dogs that are off leash. My dog was attacked by three off leash Great Danes. The financial cost of seven surgeries required for her survival was $10,000. My anxiety remains. Off leash dogs are unsafe. They should all be leashed except for fenced dog run areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Sharon A Starr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363175 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off-leash dogs at the GGNRA have harmed park visitors. Off-leash dogs have been involved in many dog fights and dog bites at the GGNRA. Off-leash dogs have been injured at the GGNRA falling off steep cliffs. Charging and growling off-leash dogs frighten visitors and hamper their ability to enjoy the GGNRA. Running dogs off-leash at the GGNRA puts the welfare of wildlife at great risk. Off-leash dogs are more likely to leave behind dog feces in the park, reducing the recreational value of the GGNRA

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6548 **Comment Id:** 368850 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I've written to you in the past detailing 2 injuries I sustained due to off leash dogs. One injury left me w / a labral tear of my hip, fractured hand and torn abdominal muscles and I was unable to work for 5 months. The second injury happened when a "friendly" high spirited dog lunged at me and it's claw drew blood all the way down my leg. Over the past several years, I've watched as dog owners took over Crissy Field with little intervention by the Park Police to enforce existing leash laws because they are scared of confrontation w / dog owners. Active people like myself fear being hit by a pack of dogs running off leash at high rates of speed; I can't imagine what would happen to the elderly or the very young should they be caught in the path of such unrestrained force. The worst are the dog walkers who bring down 8-10 dogs at a time to run and somehow believe they are in control.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Aden **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6678 **Comment Id:** 369611 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Over the last few yeai-s there have been numerous accounts of dogs negatively impacting visitor experiences. A woman visiting Crissy Field reported that her five year old son was attacked by a dog, which also gouged the leg of another child, and complained that other dogs were harassing small children in the area(2); a park visitor at Ocean Beach reported a dog

being attacked by three off leash dogs(3); a hang glider at Fort Funston was bitten by an off-leash dog (4); and an offleash dog harassed a guard on horse patrol to the point of having to be pepper sprayed(5). These are just a few examples of the conflicts that can occur with off-leash dogs.

Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Commenter: Laura Horton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Many commenters described dog owners and commercial dog walkers as dismissive and argumentative. Commenters are concerned about the sense of entitlement that the dog walkers and owners show when their dogs are harassing other visitors.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 368 **Comment Id:** 351270 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: . Now I go to the beach at Fort Funston (of Pacifica Park, take your life at risk) to enjoy the sun, sand water I've some intense experiences where I feared my bare legs would be ripped apart. Most dog owners are responsible but there are enough that are surley, inattentive on their cell phones consider my fears cries for help an inconvenience at best. When a dog is aggressively coming forward, barking incessantly, showing his teeth nipping at my clothes - I have good reason to be afraid. Packs of dogs are the worst. But one horrible time a woman was there with her boyfriends dog for fifteen minutes the dog was running rapid circles around me with her between me the dog as he fiercely growled showed his teeth. Panicked I yelled he wants to bite she said No he just wants to harm me, I'm not sure what the difference is. Finally I took refuge in a tall hefty guy walking down the beach. Suddenly the dog calmed down. The woman told me this was a rescue dog with fierce instincts to protect her.

Organization:

Commenter: Sandi Sinll **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 795 **Comment Id:** 353302 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: To someone who has been attacked, being approached by a group of unleashed dogs and a single human (often off in the distance somewhere) can be a terrifying experience. Having been in this situation I can assure you that compassionate reactions from dog walkers are rare. Mocking amusement, scoffing at the person's fear, or outright anger and aggression are far more common. Add to this those who are not steady on their feet, such as the elderly, and others who are vulnerable, such as children, and we have a situation where dog owners demanding that all areas be off leash are being extremely selfish.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Tremblay **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4279 **Comment Id:** 362354 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Secondly, I have had large off leash dogs jump up on me and nearly knock me

over while their owner laughs heartily in the distance. I have had dog walkers with 5 dogs, 4 off leash, watch as their growling dog cornered me near the stream on a hillside. When the dog walker called for the dog, he did not come, and I had to scream and pick up a stick, and the dog walker had to physically remove the dog. The trails are becoming dangerous to walk on when owners do not keep their dogs on leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy C Blotter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Several commenters expressed disdain over the large number of off leash dogs that are not under voice control. Several of these commenters have refrained from going to certain areas of the park due to the high numbers of dogs.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 108 **Comment Id:** 343886 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Many years ago, I used to go regularly to Rodeo Beach. It was my favorite place of relaxation and recreation. At a certain point the number of dogs present increased dramatically. On one occasion, I arrived in the area near the cliffs on the southern end of the main section of beach, to find that the entire beach smelled like dog feces, something I had never noticed prior to this. I lay down where I usually did to relax in the sun. About 10 minutes later a large brown dog came running at high speed directly into me. One of the dogs sharp nails went into my leg, causing a wound which bled for minutes. The owner of the dog was a young man nearby who saw what happened and was very apologetic. In retrospect it made no difference whether the owner was nice or not - the over enthusiasm of a dog of this sort cannot be controlled. The bad smell and injury caused me to leave. I went to the ranger's office and spoke with a ranger, complaining that dogs were ruining the beach and that I had been injured. He said large numbers of dog owners brought their dogs there because it was one of the few beaches where they were allowed to do so, and he suggested I send a comment to the managers. I have never returned to Rodeo Beach, and as long as dogs are allowed there with their attendant dangers and stink, I will not return. I have recommended to others that they not go there - the place smells polluted with feces and the dogs are dangerous. THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM in these negotiations is that EVERYBODY, including dog owners, knows there is no way to have an arrangement of any type which is safe and sanitary for human visitors, as long as dogs and humans are allowed to be in the same place at the same time.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. Many commenters are concerned about the impact that unruly dogs will have on small children. Being jumped on or knocked over has instilled fear of dogs in the children of several commenters. Other commenters expressed concern over the amount of damage dogs can inflict if they were to bite a young child.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 54 **Comment Id:** 338926 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I was a former dog owner - and though I love dogs; it just is not safe for young

children. A large dog can run 15-40 mph chasing after a ball launcher. That's a large impact on a child, scratching them, running over them and hurting them. My children are now afraid of dogs; and they shouldnt be. The sanitation is also a large issue. When you have many dogs, how in the world will you be able to keep track of all the dog feces if your 6-8 dogs are running in every direction.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth K Le **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 957 **Comment Id:** 353828 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have a 2-year-old who loves hiking on his own. We go to GGNRA areas frequently, but lately there have been several incidents where we were walking and without warning an off-leash dog has come bounding up to my son, jumping on him or stomping on him or just surprising him before I could make an appropriate doggy introduction or pick him up out of reach- -while the dog's owner has ineffectually shouted "he's very friendly!" from far away. I have tried to downplay the incidents in my son's mind, but the result is that now he is scared of all dogs and runs screaming from them. (I hate to think if any of these dogs had actually been unfriendly or aggressive toward him!) If there is an area where off-leash dogs and children are both present, the dogs always win, and the children always lose (from incidents where dogs scare/injure children to dog poop that hasn't been picked up). There needs to be a balance of uses.

Organization:

Commenter: Eliza K Jewett-Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. Some commenters belive that the visitors of Golden Gate National Recreation Area have learned to coexist, stating that incidents are very rare.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5312 **Comment Id:** 362950 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In all that time and on all those occasions there have been very few encounters (I can count them on the fingers of one hand) with other park users who have problems with off leash dogs. Instead all the different types of folks I've encountered on the trail seem to have learned to get along with one another, especially after it became evident that, due to funding cuts everywhere, there's no authority figure they can run to with their problems

Organization:

Commenter: Jim W Stockinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 30 **Comment Id:** 337991 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I strongly support leash only on baker beach as this is an area where I have noticed a number of conflict between dogs and wildlife or dog owners and other park visitors. I believe if this area were enforced as leash only this would significantly decrease the tension between dog walkers and other park visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 110 **Comment Id:** 345824 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have seen good dog owners and bad dog owners. By and large what I have seen is that most owners do not keep their dogs on a leash. When no one else is around that is not a big deal. However, dog owners do not keep vigilant and when the numbers of people start to go up, they do not call their dog to them and leash them up. I have seen senior citizens who have had dogs intimidate them and jump on them. It is not the dogs fault. What I have to ask, and you should as well, if what happens if a elderly citizen is knocked down by a dog? A broken hip on an 75 year old can be a death sentence to that individual. Is a shortened life an acceptable exchange for allowing dog owners to continue with their behavior of not keeping a dog on a fixed leash?

Organization: None

Commenter: James Douglas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 124 **Comment Id:** 346273 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The incidents have been rare, but over the years I've experienced off-leash dogs acting aggressively towards me, seen one snarl and chase a jogger into a bench, and observed another dog owner have to fend off unwanted attention towards his leashed dog. Creating some separation is a sensible, well thought out move. It will also be nice to enjoy the beach without having to scan for poo-bombs.

Organization:

Commenter: Peter G **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 128 **Comment Id:** 346281 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a frequent jogger and hiker (3 times/week) at the sites I will comment on. In summary, I have experienced that only about Â½ of the off-leash dogs I encounter are truly under voice control. Dogs often run after me and occasionally bite me. I am often forced to stop running and ask the owner to get the dog under control. Often they cannot.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 166 **Comment Id:** 349918 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I have been tripped by dogs while I'm jogging. At 70 years old, tripping and falling is a serious matter! So I fully support the NPS leash plan and restrictions on roaming dogs. I am a dog lover, but we need greater responsibility from dog owners. Leashes are a reasonable restriction and protect us, the wildlife and even other small dogs from harm.
Organization:
Commenter: Robert Barone **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 308 **Comment Id:** 350555 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As a dog owner and Parent of 3 young children I welcome the enforcement and request dogs on leash at Sutro Park. I have had my young children jumped on and knocked over to the floor by dogs more than 5 times in the past 6 years and I have had to kick unleased dogs off my kids. The part that is most disturbing is that the dog owners don't pay attention to their dogs when they are off leash. Additionaly when I am out with just my dog on a leash other dogs charge us. It is not safe at all for kids and we have a lot more kids now in the neighborhood. We all go to the park at the same time after work dog owners and kids and there is no enforcement officers to provide a safe ennviroment for kids.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 345 **Comment Id:** 350632 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Saturday, Nov 9 around 1030 I was walking (in the direction of the Warming Hut and GGB) across the "wooden bridge" watching the birds below. I stopped (close to the guard rail and bench) to text my son to let him know where I was. A dog, running with a (about 2 ft, I would guess) stick in his mouth, hit me from behind, full speed ahead. The dog (and owner) continued on their run. The back of my leg was gashed, other walkers stopped to my aid. One of them knew of the Emergency Care Center on Scott and Lombard. I spent the rest of the morning and part of the afternoon at Emergency Care, (instead of meeting my son for his birthday celebration). I drove back to Sacramento and he went back to Mt View. The wound required 10 stitches.
Organization:
Commenter: Sharon Klotz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 355 **Comment Id:** 351006 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Unfortunately, too many dog owners are not responsible owners, especially

those who maintain that their dog does not need a leash because it is under "voice-control." Such dog owners are often hostile and become abusive and threatening toward other park users who object to being approached by unleashed dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 357 **Comment Id:** 351070 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I fully support the GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan (SEIS). The problem of uncontrolled dogs (leashed and unleashed) is an endangerment to people, other living creatures, and vegetation. I've been a life-long walker and, am now, a senior citizen. In the 'leashed dogs only' portion of the San Francisco GGNRA I have been chased, threatened, run into, and tripped by dogs whose owners couldn't or wouldn't control them. Owners of offending dogs were either far away, had no effective 'voice control,' were dismissive of my complaints, or blamed me for their dogs' behavior.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane Church-McDaniel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 367 **Comment Id:** 351268 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Yesterday, I was attacked by a large vicious dog on the Crissy Field beach. I almost went to the hospital and instead saw my doctor. I am very, very upset and scared. This was the second time I have walked on the beach in quite a while, out of fear because of past incidents, and now I will not do it again. I am 62 years old, well able to walk, but not that strong. I have osteoporosis, so if I fall I am at risk of fractures

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Rosiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1180 **Comment Id:** 351926 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog owners say that the problem is limited to a few individual owners dogs that the problem self-corrects. This is nonsense. I was attacked by dogs several times and jumped on dozens and dozens of times. Not once did any other dog owner assist or intervene. And no officer was around. Please protect the needs of people, especially vulnerable populations.

Organization:

Commenter: John Mortimer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1187 **Comment Id:** 351947 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Another concern with free running dogs is (2) lack of control over defecating dogs. The latter point presents health risks for small children and infants playing at Ocean Beach

(and other beaches) not to speak of the intimidating effect of a huge dog on an infant sitting in the sand (we have been victimized in this manner many years ago earning the only but very common response by the owner "he/she (it??) is a friendly dog" (which is only for us but not for the dog owner to decide!).

Organization:

Commenter: Christian Paech **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1353 **Comment Id:** 352388 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, the dogs crap all over the beach (and many owners don't scoop), they chase birds (including threatened species), jump up on people that want nothing to do with them (and have destroyed my headset for my iphone on one occasion when a dog jumped up and clawed my chest), and generally create havoc. Many dog owners are responsible with their pets, but many are not. When I have(courteously) informed some dog owners that their dog was off leash in an on leash area, I have been physically threatened, verbally abused and harassed.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1400 **Comment Id:** 352447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is rarely the case when I don't see off leash dogs running through the new plantings, damaging the work to preserve habitat for endangered species. I have been afraid several times for my safety and that of my son because of pitbull and similar breeds off-leash, as well as other large dogs chasing wildly through the area with their owners far from any ability to curb and control their dogs. I realize there are a number of respectful dog owners, but it only takes one neglectful owner to precipitate a tragedy.

Organization:

Commenter: Summer Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 600 **Comment Id:** 352695 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: PLEASE do not allow professional dog walkers into any GGNRA areas. in the past six months I have been bitten by an OFF LEASH dog being walked by a completely inattentive dog walker, at least 12 OFF LEASH dogs, none of which responded to any voice control. the dog who bit me, hole in the jeans and 6 puncture wounds, a truly vicious dog. and also in the past six months, i was knocked to the ground, on the beach, by several OFF LEASH large dogs, running out of any control, a pack of at least 10, dog walker had no voice control whatsoever. seniors are especially vulnerable to these irresponsible dog walkers!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1473 **Comment Id:** 352864 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: i was bitten on the leg while i was walking my dog - who was leashed - by a dog who was not on a leash and decided to attack out of the blue. the owner could not control her dog and as i tried to get her dog away from mine i was bitten. the owner stood and screamed and felt somehow that that was her contribution to controlling her out of control dog. certainly this situation could have been if not alleviated, at least less problematic had her dog been leashed.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1511 **Comment Id:** 352961 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have no problem with dogs, we love small pets. However, in public places, unleashed dogs should be avoided. On Pacifica beach a dog attacked my wife, threw her on ground and climbed on top of her while she was shouting keep the dog away. The owner of the dog lady just stood there and saying.. "oh, he is just playing with you, he is very gentle and very friendly"

Organization:

Commenter: alok kumar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 728 **Comment Id:** 353060 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Along with fellow residents of our home for the elderly, I walk Crissy Field in the early morning hours of Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. One of our fellow walkers, Norma Chan, no longer walks with us since she fell on the path after having been knocked down by a dog which was not leashed. Several months ago I suffered a dizzying blow to the side of my head from a ball that had been in effect "shot" by a dog's owner who used a wand to send the ball a greater distance for her unleashed dog to chase. This suggests that unleashed dogs present a menace to those who walk Crissy Field, at least during the more heavily traveled daylight hours between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.

Organization: San Francisco Towers

Commenter: gerald d adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 747 **Comment Id:** 353114 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My wife and I are 85 yrs. old and walk often at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Sigmund Stern Grove. We have no dog, and find often that we are almost the only ones without a pet. We both use canes, walk slowly, and try to enjoy the beauty of our surroundings. 1) We have come close to being knocked over by large dogs chasing each other. 2) We are often annoyed by the loud, shouting voices of the commercial dog walkers calling their tardy "clients".

Organization:

Commenter: david p holman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 757 **Comment Id:** 353131 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Off-leash and even on-leash dogs approach me, growl at me, jump up on me, and escalate aggressive behaviors when they see that I'm afraid of them. Dog owners laugh or casually say to me, "Oh don't worry, she doesn't bite," or "He just wants to play, that's his way of being friendly" and then that same dog starts barking in a mean manner or looking like it's going to bite or jumps on me and then the owner looks surprised. By then it's sometimes too late, especially when the dog is close to me and off leash and the owner can't call their dog off successfully. Another recurring problem is collared dogs whose owners are letting them run off leash, while the owners hold the (empty) leash. About half of such owners immediately call their dog back and put it back on the leash long before I get closer; that's great and it's much appreciated. But other owners aren't paying attention and don't act fast enough, or they call their dog back but the dog ignores them and runs toward me barking aggressively. I can't outrun a dog. I'm reluctant, when hiking by myself, to get into an confrontation with a dog owner or challenge them about their dog's behavior or about the rules of the park, especially on a trail where nobody else is in sight. I want to be able to hike in my parks without being afraid of being jumped on, growled at, or bitten by someone's aggressive dog.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4257 **Comment Id:** 353151 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Last weekend my family, consisting of my spouse and my 19-year-old son, Sam, traveled to Muir Beach to see the recently completed restoration work on Redwood Creek. Sam loves beaches (as do his mother and I) and so a much anticipated secondary purpose of our trip was to take a walk along Muir Beach. However, our trip did not include a beach walk. Why, you may ask, did my family's visit to Muir Beach not include an activity that members of my family greatly enjoy? Let me explain. Sam is afflicted with an autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Like many ASD kids and adults, he has certain sensory sensitivities, aka phobias. One of these sensitivities is triggered by off-leash (but not on-leash) dogs. This sensitivity may stem from a childhood experience in which he was threatened by a dog that he encountered. The point is that this sensitivity exists. At the current time, as GGNRA officials well know, Muir Beach is open to off-leash dog use. On the day of our visit the beach was crowded with off-leash dogs, with little effort that was apparent to us on the part of the owners of these dogs to exert control over or limit in any way the movements of the dogs. (Some public park managers, the EBRPD being the principal case in point, indulge in the fiction that dog owners can successfully be instructed to keep their off-leash dogs "under control.") So the universal presence of off-leash dogs at Muir Beach precluded us from visiting the beach, something we otherwise would most certainly have done. The access exclusion that we experienced constituted a clear and indisputable violation of the GGNRA's obligations under the Americans' With Disabilities Act (ADA) not to discriminate against persons with disabilities in managing the park areas under its jurisdiction. I understand that the revised dog management plan that the GGNRA currently has under consideration will

alleviate at least some of the conditions noted above at Muir Beach and elsewhere. If so I strongly urge its adoption.

Organization:

Commenter: John B Bowers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1766 **Comment Id:** 353748 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Unfortunately due to some fog owners who careless about others, it is a great initiative to restrain off-leash of dogs in public spaces. I had dog bite my 6 YO and the reply I got was: "nothing I can do about it". Or, stepped more than once on dog feces in the beach or our community park and garden.

Organization:

Commenter: Yoram N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2974 **Comment Id:** 355294 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I actually do not oppose the plan because many dog owners are not responsible when they use parks or public recreation lands with their dogs. It's quite com mon they let the dogs run free. It's hard to go for a walk without being bothered by unleashed dogs. I have been attacked and bitten by free running dogs before when on Ocean Beach.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Alan Hightman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2058 **Comment Id:** 355607 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I like to hike in the GG National Recreation Area. I have been aggressively approached by large off-leash dogs on several occasions. I object to this. I have been bit by dogs and object to them approaching me. I object to being made afraid by the simple act of taking a hike. It's my strong opinion that dog owners should compromise on this issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Bob Frost **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6657 **Comment Id:** 357110 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I love close to where Pacifica Police had to shoot a pit bull who killed his pregnant owner. The dog was allowed to sleep in his owners bed and was thought of as "one of the family". It was allowed to run off leash at Mori Pt and on the beach. It could have killed someone else as easily as it killed its owner. Children and everyone else deserve to be safe from clueless dog owners like this one.

Organization:

Commenter: Julia Thomas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2293 **Comment Id:** 357648 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Every time I visit a park in the San Francisco area, regardless of policy, I find that owners tend to have their dogs off-leash, for better or worse. The danger of people shirking policy is that the bad dog owners win. Those who are okay potentially endangering the safety of children or other animals are the ones who will begin to dominate our parks and those who are looking for a safe and managed space to let their dogs off-leash will have no where to go. This not only endangers the lives of people but also infringes upon the rights of those dog owners who do effectively manage and clean up after their pets. The people who should be impacted by this are not the ones making use of approved spaces but those who do not make use of those spaces.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3027 **Comment Id:** 357717 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm a frequent user of the trails near my house, both hiking and biking and have been bitten (I've filed a report with Park police) chased, and lunged at too many times to count. I now carrying pepper spray because I fear all the off leash dogs that gather around Alta trail (as many as 40 if not more most days)

Organization:

Commenter: Serena Dugan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2410 **Comment Id:** 358909 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs need to be on leash in public areas, period. I have been attacked when on my bicycle just minding my own business and the owner said, "He was just wanting to play with you". My child has been knocked down by a "he's a good dog, he would never hurt anyone". A large portion of dog owners do not pick after their defecating animals.

Organization:

Commenter: Eric H **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3611 **Comment Id:** 359257 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Time and time again, I see dogs off leash in places where they are supposed to be on leash. I have learned that "under voice control" is a fictional state. I have seen plastic bags of dog poop scattered along trails. I have encountered dog owners who aggressively insist on their rights to break the rules. A friend of mine broke his hip after an off-leash dog ran in front of his bicycle on the Railroad Grade. The dog owners ran off.

Organization: self

Commenter: Eve Pell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3732 **Comment Id:** 359425 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It works; there are few issues; 99%+ tors use responsibly; even the NPS statistics support that there is less than one dog related issue per 20,000 visitors.
Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth V Mooney **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3968 **Comment Id:** 360270 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On the Old San Pedro road trail while riding uphill, I came upon three large German Shepard's - off leash and out of sight of their owners who had sat down for a break around a corner. One bit me on the hand, and one got behind me. The other was barking aggressively. I was so freaked out that I cancelled the rest of my ride and turned around. The teller at the BofA was the one who noticed I was bleeding.
Organization:
Commenter: Mike C **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3968 **Comment Id:** 360271 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On the Baquiano trail, just above the Fassler trailhead, I was attacked by two Pit Bulls - Off Leash and out of control of their handler who was holding a baby in her hands. This lady was not even from Pacifica but had heard it was a great place to let the dogs run wild off-leash. And they were her daughters dogs, which explained why this lady had absolutely No Verbal Control while the snapped and barked at me.
Organization:
Commenter: Mike C **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4549 **Comment Id:** 360569 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Last month, a very large labrador approached my two sons who were strapped into their stroller while we were walking down a very busy section of FIllmore Street. It shoved its nose in my son's face. My son pushed him away. This dog was off-leash and the owner casually said "he's friendly." No matter how friendly, dog owners cannot always predict their own dog's reaction, nor can they predict the reaction of a startled toddler who has just been accosted by an uninvited large dog. Prior to that, my 2 year old son has been knocked over by large dogs running off-leash in Julius Khan Park and again INSIDE the gated playground in Alta Plaza Park.
Organization:
Commenter: Rachel Holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4639 **Comment Id:** 361157 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not support increasing unleashed dogs in the GGNRA. Despite owners' protests to the contrary, dogs' conduct cannot be predicted with accuracy. Keeping a dog under control by voice commands is unrealistic, uncertain and often unsuccessful. Dogs run into and jump onto others, such as hikers, without warning. People fall and get needlessly hurt. Moreover, people are frightened and intimidated. It is unconscionable to permit this. The enjoyment of dogs or dog owners should not trump the safety rights of other people

Organization:

Commenter: Marc L Sherman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4643 **Comment Id:** 361163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have lived in San Francisco for many years and can share the numerous encounters we have had with irresponsible dog owners who assume we want their unleashed animals jumping on us or our personal property in public places before we have to alert the owners of our allergies. Most often the response from dog owners is surprisingly not an apology but rather an indication that they are entitled to do what they wish even to the detriment of other persons.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4707 **Comment Id:** 361361 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I would prefer to see dogs that stay on leash at all times unless there is a dog run. They should be kept away from areas that ordinary citizens enjoy and away from children because you never know if a dog could turn on child or person and bite or maul them. There have been cases where children have been attacked by dogs and as a parent you can never know if a dog will be ok around a child.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4842 **Comment Id:** 361623 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have never heard of a dog bite at Chrissy Field and in the many visits, I have not witnessed any dog aggression.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Baranowski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5110 **Comment Id:** 362194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off-leash dogs in these areas pose no danger; a tiny minority of irresponsible guardians is to blame for any issues that arise. Deal with them, and you will eliminate any safety issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Lauren Hauptman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5231 **Comment Id:** 362739 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my experience, voice and sight control is not a form of control that a person, such as myself, who doesn't like to be approached, jumped on, barked at in very close range, or otherwise harassed by unknown dogs can count on. A person walking on the beach has no way of knowing which dogs on voice control are really on voice control and which are simply running around without leashes. As an example, while I was walking, an unleashed dog, which appeared to be part pit bull, ran out of the dunes, coming to a halt about 2 feet from me. For about a minute, it stood there, barking and growling and looking at me in a threatening manner. I froze, my heart racing, looking in vain for someone whose voice would control this dog and get it away from me, but there was no one in the vicinity. Eventually the dog ran beyond me toward the ocean and I was able to continue on. In a minute, two people, who appeared to be looking for and calling a dog by name, came out of the dunes. I asked them if they were looking for a dog of this dog's description. When they said they were, and I told them about the encounter I had with this dog, they told me that was impossible, that their dog had never threatened anyone, etc. and they accused me of threatening their dog!

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Sprinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5304 **Comment Id:** 362930 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs create conflicts, between off leash dogs that attack each other to dogs that attack humans or knock over children. I had a dog until recently, and we plan to get another. Our dog was attacked by off-leash dogs a few times on separate trails in Mill Valley.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5391 **Comment Id:** 363042 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many favorite trails are now overrun with off leash dogs that are not command responsive or may respond "sometimes". When chasing rabbits or squirrels or birds, commands are ignored by the majority of canines. These trails are no longer pleasant and instead intimidating, as one never knows when they will encounter an animal that is often wary and nervous. Dog fights on trails are not uncommon, likely due to nervous or territorial dogs.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon

Commenter: Leora Feeney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363302 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Several times being approached by a vicious appearing dog, yelling at the owner to call it off, not knowing if my leg is about to bit off. Owner far away or looking at me like something is wrong with me, not with the dog. Or the frequent remark: "oh, he's really a friendly dog, never hurt anbody".
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5488 **Comment Id:** 363353 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We have NEVER had any issue with our dog, anyone else's dog, nor any other recreational users. We are always respectful of the rules and other's space.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Palmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5578 **Comment Id:** 363960 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I take my 3 pound Chihuahua for walks through Fort Funston and have never encountered any problems with other off leash dogs or owners. I have found the community to be considerate of eachother and of the area. We respect the site and treasure the opportunity to have this location. I feel safer today on my walks at Fort Funston than I did in years past when fewer people where there. Please dont change it.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5627 **Comment Id:** 364029 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In fourteen years of visiting Fort Funston with our dogs several times a month, we have never seen any significant unpleasant incident regarding dogs. What we have seen is the occasional unpleasant tangle of peoples' legs from leashes in use in this constrained pathway.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5632 **Comment Id:** 364048 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs frighten off wildlife in the park. They chase birds. They are the only park 'visitors' that routinely defecate and urinate in the park. They bite people! Children who are at face level with most of the dogs in the park are at risk from dog attacks while playing in the park.

Dogs bark. The tranquility of a day in the park is disturbed by the presence of dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: georgina j monahan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5737 **Comment Id:** 364202 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If it weren't for the bad behavior of some dog owners and canines that can not be controlled, I would be opposed to the banning of dogs to the proposed areas. I have seen children feeling threatened by dogs and dogs chasing birds. It is reasonable to regulate access to dogs in National Parks. Please implement the plan. It is thoughtful and protective.
Organization:
Commenter: Piper Cafferata **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5777 **Comment Id:** 364286 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On countless occasions, owners have let dogs contaminate waterways by not picking up feces; have actively ignored posted signs pertaining to presence of endangered species; and have created situations in which both humans and dogs could be injured. When a dog is off-leash, it is unknown to the general public whether the animal will or will not listen to voice commands or if the animal is in fact of a more peaceful demeanor or not.
Organization: Concerned Citizen
Commenter: Andy Keller **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5848 **Comment Id:** 364398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a father of two young boys living in the city, I get very frustrated by how a city of people is over run by dog owners and dogs who have abused the lack of signage to allow all sized dogs to run free without a leash. Many times a week when one approaches my kids, I am told 'he is friendly'. That doesn't matter to me...maybe my 1 year old isn't friendly because he hasn't spent a lot of time with an 80 lb lab and will poke him in the eye because the dog is pushing his mouth in my sons face; and who knows how friendly that un leashed dog will then be? I have been biten and harassed by all kinds of "friendly" dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Ben holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5851 **Comment Id:** 364403 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When children (often 2-4 years old) are attacked by dogs, the resulting lacerations (often on the face) are often large and deep and leave scars; they can lead to serious infections. In the worst case, dog attacks can be fatal, as happened years ago here in an infamous and gruesome case.

Organization:
Commenter: Nima Afshar **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5905 **Comment Id:** 364511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am an avid runner and have had several incidents with dogs including being chased, scratched, and nearly bitten on three different occasions. This has happened along crissy field, baker beach, batteries to bluffs, and throughout the presidio. The reactions from these dog owners has varied from apologetic, to laughing, to outright hostile and confrontational. The last being an incident involving a young man with a large male pit bull off- leash which I reported to the park police. The situation has become so bad that I have resorted to carrying dog spray while running. Although these incidents have been rare, they have the capability of resulting in grave bodily harm or even death.
Organization:
Commenter: Kavan G Manson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5991 **Comment Id:** 364869 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: have been going to Fort Funston almost weekly ever since we got our dog, and it is the happiest we ever see him. It is great for all the dogs to run free, and play and swim, and we have never had a bad experience with other dogs, or witnessed a bad person/dog interaction.
Organization:
Commenter: Chris Finegold **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6040 **Comment Id:** 365020 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There's not enough off leash areas as it is & if people without dogs want an area to go - there are MANY places already for them & if people are afraid of dogs - they should go to those areas NOT designed & set aside for Dogs. Sure, there have been a few complaints & problems but there's no perfect place. I think it's important to remember that the number of complaints about people (visitors) out weigh those about dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: hannah j st. martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4411 **Comment Id:** 365157 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: My toddler was knocked down by a large unleashed dog at Crissy field and developed a fear of dogs that lasted years. There are too many places in the park where a family cannot sit down with young children or food and be safe from invading dogs. The alarming sight of uncontrolled dogs running down shorebirds and horses must stop.
Organization:

Commenter: Gloria Koch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6114 **Comment Id:** 365440 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have also had the extremely unpleasant experience of having to stop, start, stop, wheel my car around in order to avoid dogs which were not on leashes. After endangering my life in order to save the life of a little dog running loose in a parking lot or in the middle of a street adjacent to a park, the owners appear and tell me that the dog is under "voice control." This is simply insane. Each time this happened, the owner would be calling and calling while the dog, either confused and lost or over excited by the traffic and running, just kept running away from the owner. In both cases, if I had not had great reflexes the dogs and possibly the owners would have been smashed.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie J Friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6138 **Comment Id:** 365595 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Thank you for restricting dogs in Chrissy field. I am an elderly lady who enjoys walking on the beach, but I am afraid of being knocked down by the large dogs running around on the beach. They are unpredictable and often out of control. Their owners are not able to control them. Thank you for preserving the beaches for people!
Organization:
Commenter: Allison N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6229 **Comment Id:** 366147 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have never seen (and I can't even remember hearing) of any problems caused by the presence of dogs on or off-leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Jay Kammen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6235 **Comment Id:** 366153 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I bring my dog here almost every day and the dogs here all seem to get along, and I have never had an issue with "dog-violence" or any other problem due to animals not being on a leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Scott Rooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6277 **Comment Id:** 366397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Even though most of the dogs are well behaved and are voice controlled it is common, almost daily, to observe dogs that are totally out of control; dogs chasing and fighting with other dogs, chasing after other walkers and bicyclist, nipping or biting people (this even happened to me as I walked to my office), and much more. And, it's not just the dogs but also the owners who don't pick up after their dogs, or if they do they leave the plastic bags lay on the ground for someone else to pick up. How is any of this considerate for others.

Organization:

Commenter: Fred Picavet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6299 **Comment Id:** 366475 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I hope strict ON LEASH laws are passed. For the sake of people with children. These Off leash areas are unsafe. Animals are unpredictable We became aware of this when our 4 year old Was bit by a pit bill this year.

Organization: Mom in PAC heights

Commenter: Tami N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6621 **Comment Id:** 367470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Though unfortunate, negative situations will occur but are almost always covered by specific regulations that are broken by careless dog owners. To apply a blanket restriction because of a few scofflaws is inappropriate.

Organization:

Commenter: Dixon Power **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6648 **Comment Id:** 368222 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: At Fort Funston, I've often seen dog walkers with several dogs, frequently off leash, disturbing, even frightening other visitors, and in two instances causing injury! This aside from environmental damage they are causing.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim Morrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368384 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Visitors with children feel that their childs safety is threatened because in fact their childs safety is threatened. The issue with the safety of children is not just a perception of visitors, it is an established fact. This fact is almost completely ignored in the SEIS. It should be noted that although there is a considerable literature on the especial risks of dogs attacking children, there is little literature on other groups that may be similarly vulnerable, including the

elderly, physically or emotionally disabled, and those engaging in sports or other physical activity that conflicts with off-leash dog activity. Although the SEIS does mention that children and the elderly have a increased likelihood of being the victims of attacks by dogs, the SEIS does not fully address the safety issue in an explicit manner and apply safety risk management to policy alternatives of dog management.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368391 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA visitor cannot control the risk to her/his safety where off leash dogs are permitted. Certain types of dogs, such as pit bulls, may be associated with a higher risk of serious bite injury (Bini et al. 2011) and older, active children are more often bitten by pit bulls (Reisner 2013). In one review of dog bite data, most older children bitten in an outdoor setting were unfamiliar with the attacking dog and were not interacting with the dog (Reisner et al. 2011). As stated above under Voice Control, some dog walkers bring high risk dogs to GGNRA and allow them to run off leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368393 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When an attack on a child does occur, there is a significant chance of a fatality. One study estimated that a risk of 2 fatalities per 1,000 reported dog bites exists nationwide (Wright 1985). Although most studies show that fatalities typically occur in residential settings, there is still a real possibility of a fatality in GGNRA because of the concentration of visitors with children and lack of control over the type of off-leash dogs present. GGNRA must fully and explicitly address this risk in the EIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6546 **Comment Id:** 368848 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My wife is 72 years old and weighs 110 pounds. Recently she got charged by a 50-60 pound dog in the Sutro Heights Park. The owners tried to call it back but it ignored them. I had to fend it off with my walking stick until the owners could get it on a leash. Dogs are supposed to be on-leash in this park, but most dog owners Jet them run free. Also in the Sutro Heights Park, I once got surrounded by three little dogs, the kind that yap at you insanely. The owner did not even try to call them off until I started to phone the police. In the Marin Headlands out above Rodeo beach, my friends and I-all old people-got charged by four aggressive dogs. One of my friends, aged 78, lifted his coat above his head to make himself look bigger, and charged back. The dogs scattered. Once I was walking near the Octagon just below the VA

hospital when I was charged at by five or six little yapping dogs. The owner was not able to get them under control for a long time. All this has happened in the last five or six years. I think that as I get older, dogs sense my frailty and attack. Now I have to carry a walking stick for fear of being bitten. You will see a lot of old people carrying walking sticks, and in some cases, golf clubs. Having to go armed takes a lot of the joy out of walking. More often old people simply stop walking in the parks. This is a shame because when you get old, walking is about the only exercise you have left.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Hanenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369658 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In testimony before the San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare Commission on February 8, 2007, Jean Donaldson, the founder and then-director of the SF/SPCA Dog Training Academy said: Off-leash play has not proven to be a factor in dog bites. According to both the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American Veterinarian Medical Association, the majority of bites take place on the guardians property. The remaining incidents involve dogs that are either restrained, i.e., leashed, or dogs that are at large, [that is,] unsupervised dogs that have escaped confinement. Consider for example, the three highest profile serious dog attacks in the history of San Francisco. Those are Diane Whipple in 2001, Sean Jones in 2001, and Nicholas Faibish in 2005. In the first, the dogs were on-leash. In the second, the dogs had escaped confinement in the backyard and were at large. And in the third, the dog was confined in the guardians home. I would add that in all these instances, the dogs were un-neutered. Interestingly, it could very well be that the safest dogs are those that attend off-leash dog parks. Shyan and cohorts published a research paper in 2003 in the Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science which looked at the prevalence of interdog aggression in dog parks. Dog-dog problems turned out to be minimal and of a non-serious nature. While the paper did not consider the question of dog-to-human aggression, the obvious interpretation of this low incidence of aggression was interesting and I think very relevant. They suggested that self-selection operates strongly, i.e., people who take the time to get into their car or walk to a designated off-leash area to exercise their dog tend to not be the type who are derelict in other areas of dog guardianship, such as training, socialization or appropriate containment. Note: The study she referred to is: Bark Parks - A Study on Interdog Aggression in a Limited-Control Environment, by Melissa R. Shyan, Kristina A. Fortune, and Christine King, Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science, vol. 6, no. 1, 2003 Again, I gave the GGNRA this information as part of a DEIS comment (submitted as Chair of the Animal Control and Welfare Commission), yet it was ignored. Instead the SETS chose to present information on dog bites in a sensational manner designed to convince readers of the need for restricting off-leash access to prevent dog bites.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

LP1000 Laws and Policies: Impact of GGNRA actions on other NPS units' enforcement of servicewide policies and regulations (Substantive)

1. **Commenters expressed concern that allowing the GGNRA to be open for off-leash dog use would encourage or justify having dogs in other NPS units. This could result in adverse impacts in other sensitive areas of the national park system.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1555 **Comment Id:** 353097 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Above all, if you permit rampant dog off leash areas in GGNRA, the dog owners will then ask that even more sensitive areas such as Yellowstone, Yosemite and other great national parks to be opened up, to the detriment of wildlife. Please maintain on leash rules for all national parks and recreation areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Sandra Yagi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365536 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Precedent Setting Nature Not Addressed The DSEIS reports that GGNRA is the only facility in the entire national park system that allows off leash dogs. "Dogs that are not controlled by caging or a leash no longer than six feet are currently prohibited across the entire national park system (36 CFR 2.(a)(2))...." The DSEIS should address the nationwide implications of opening areas to off-leash dogs at GGNRA. It is a significant concern that allowing off-leashed dogs at GGNRA could be used to justify and encourage opening other parks to off-leash dogs. This would significantly broaden the adverse impacts of off-leash dogs on wildlife and natural habitats. This is a major potential impact that should be addressed.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366918 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: GGNRA is also perpetuating a horrific precedent that will reverberate throughout the National Park system by having regulations pertaining to pets at odds with those at nearly every other NPS site. I already encounter many pet owners walking their dogs on the trails of PRNS who express surprise that pets aren't permitted on these trails given that they frequently walk their dogs in GGNRA...and aren't both PRNS and GGNRA NPS sites...and if they can walk their dogs on GGNRA trails, why not within PRNS?

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Allowing commercial dog walking would set a bad precedent within the NPS.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5200 **Comment Id:** 362590 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Nearly all national parks strictly control the presence of dogs; it would be an extraordinarily bad precedent for the Park Service to sanction commercial dog walking in GGNRA, essentially turning a resource that belongs to all Americans over to a commercial enterprise that would damage park resources and make GGNRA a less desirable (and, for some, frightening) place to visit.

Organization:

Commenter: Trent W Orr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 5792 **Comment Id:** 364311 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is disturbing to NSAS that the policy on dogs off leash can be made by your administration which would set a precedent to other parks, monuments, etal under the National Park Service jurisdiction.

Organization: Napa-Solano Audubon Society

Commenter: Robin L Leong **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1139 **Comment Id:** 368755 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Organization:

Commenter: Alan Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369487 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA/NPS/DOI certainly does not want us setting a precedent for other NPS units such as the one in New York or Washington DC. The GGNRA/NPS/DOI does not want to identify or solve problems pertaining to dogs - -they simply want dogs and their guardians excluded from the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

LU1000 Land Use: Policies and Historical Use (Substantive)

1. **The original intention of the land was for dog use. The GGNRA was created with off-leash dog use as one of the original uses of the land; dog walking should continue. Some commenters noted that the new dog plan does not align with the historical use of the land or the recreational intent of why these areas were created.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 4996 **Comment Id:** 361902 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: But to restrict off-leash dog use in a recreational area that is part of a city like San Francisco, which has a long tradition of its people recreating with its dogs in many forms, goes completely against the grain of the use of these lands and is not what the City of San Francisco intended when they deeded you these lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Merrick Wolfe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362887 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When the GGNRA was created in 1972, dog walking was already a long-standing use of the lands that were turned over to the park. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, and as such this specific recreational use and part of the San Francisco Bay culture - and this use must continue indefinitely.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5530 **Comment Id:** 363905 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am against this plan because it takes away the traditional uses that come with the land when it was transferred from the City of San Francisco to the GGNRA. The 1979 recreational uses included allowing people to throw a ball or a frisbee to their dogs on the beach or to go running with their dogs off leash or to simply allow their dog to play with another dog on the beach - one of the loveliest sights ever.

Organization:

Commenter: Megan G Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5969 **Comment Id:** 364830 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe this use by my family and my dog and other dog owners is completely consistent with the founding goals of the GGNRA - to provide recreational opportunities for both local residents and visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: Gillian Manning **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters stated that people and dogs have been using the GGNRA lands responsibly for decades. Dog walking occurred in these areas long before the GGNRA was created. Many of these areas are former military lands, and dog walking is consistent with this history.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5235 **Comment Id:** 362744 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: National Park rules such as dogs in parkling lots do not apply. Furthermore there is legal precedent for off-leash recreation, especially up to the high-tide line on beaches where the land belong to all Californians. The historical use of these lands has been for military purposes for several centuries, so continued human and pet use is consistent with historical use.

Organization:

Commenter: Angela M Cahill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5280 **Comment Id:** 362869 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need off leash time to get adequate exercise. People and dogs have been enjoying the GGNRA for this purpose for decades, and off leash areas should be protected in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane I Gaito **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5349 **Comment Id:** 362999 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs and dog-walking, both on and off leash, existed in the lands now controlled by the GGNRA before the GGNRA was created.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Bouchard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5499 **Comment Id:** 363879 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am especially appalled at the restrictions being proposed for Marin County areas of the GGNRA! Not even allowing on leash access to areas that have been available to residents in Marin and Sonoma counties for literally decades and decades.

Organization: self employed dog trainer

Commenter: Aleen Vorhies **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368228 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The communities of Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada have a long history of responsible off-leash dog walking in Rancho. The Montara Dog Group (MDG), which has over 400 members and represents over 600 dogs from Half Moon Bay to Pacifica, have been good stewards to the area, providing waste bins, promoting responsible dog guardianship and caring for an area the GGNRA, presently, does not have the infrastructure or resources to maintain.
Organization:
Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. **One commenter noted that the description of historical dog use at Rancho Corral de Tierra in the SEIS was inaccurate, as it did not take into account the longer history of landowners allowing off-leash dogs on the property.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6547 **Comment Id:** 368661 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I bring to your attention this phrase regarding Rancho: "Historically, although off-leash dog walking was not officially sanctioned by the previous private owner, off-leash use occurred frequently." This statement is weak in its portrayal of historic use because 1) POST (Peninsula Open Space Trust) was the landowner for only about 13 of the past 32 years; their policies of dog walking were not clearly posted throughout that period. For the preceding 20 years, there have be NO OBJECTIONS posted or otherwise by landowners to dog walking by voice control. This was not just negligence on the part of the previous landowners - I was in touch with each of them because of my sustained lease of pasture for horses. My point: your premise of"Historically" is biased to a minor portion of our history, rather the majority of time supported voice-control dog walking. A more accurate portrayal our historic use would be "Historically, off leash dog walking was highly used and valued in two concentrated areas"
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Harden **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 821 **Comment Id:** 351405 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Organization:

Commenter: Travis N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1443 **Comment Id:** 352566 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is a fundamental error in the status quo assumed for GGNRA's No Action alternative in the SEIS. As acknowledged on page 60 of the SETS, there has been a long history of off-leash dog walking at Rancho, although not officially sanctioned. As such, off-leash dog walking should be the status quo or baseline for GGNRA's No Action alternative, not on-leash dog walking

Organization: Montara Dog Group

Commenter: William R Bechtell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1535 **Comment Id:** 352724 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I urge you to reject the current plan and to adopt the original 1979 Pet Policy which was affirmed as legal and the current law of the land by Federal Judge William Alsup in 2005.

Organization:

Commenter: Melanie Loftus **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3312 **Comment Id:** 353320 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Organization:

Commenter: Maurice Conti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5017 **Comment Id:** 362010 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is a fundamental error in the status quo assumed for GGNRA's No Action alternative in the SEIS. As acknowledged on page 60 of the SEIS, there has been a long history of off-leash dog walking at Rancho Corral de Tierra, although not officially sanctioned. As such, off-leash dog walking should be the status quo or baseline for GGNRA's No Action

alternative, not on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Marilyn F Wacks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5185 **Comment Id:** 362525 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are valid reasons why the dog policy in the GGNRA has always differed from the policy in other national parks. Dogs and dog-walking, both on and off leash, existed in the lands now controlled by the GGNRA before the GGNRA was created. Dogs should be regarded not as something foreign from which the environment must be protected, but as part of the urban environment which can co-exist in harmony with the the other parts of that environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen Gimber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5251 **Comment Id:** 362813 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you restrict areas that have been used for decades by people walking their dogs off leash, there will be no place for this activity. If you eliminate off leash access for dogs within the GGNRA you will be changing the original intention for these parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Nightingale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5270 **Comment Id:** 362850 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When the lands that are now GGNRA were handed over to NPS in 1973, it was with the understanding that the lands would be managed for the recreational needs of our urban population, which includes dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine C Cowdery **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5287 **Comment Id:** 362883 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When local governments gave control of the properties like Fort Funston to the GGNRA the idea was to preserve open space for generations. Not to create a people free wilderness. My conclusion is that the park service should not be involved in running the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Carola Hamann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5424 **Comment Id:** 363200 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I believe it is important to note that when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs in this urban recreational area. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Lynn Keller **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5472 **Comment Id:** 363335 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA was built and designed for dogwalking from its inception. Congressional reports referred to dog walking specifically as one of the uses for the space when the GGNRA was created.
Organization:
Commenter: Kalyn L Chomko **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5526 **Comment Id:** 363901 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This is a RECREATION area and the unique situation of a real community in the middle of it must be dealt with in an equally unique manner. National park policies can not be applied here unilaterally.
Organization:
Commenter: Carol Lankford-Gross **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5546 **Comment Id:** 363926 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5550 **Comment Id:** 363935 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SF has had a long history of allowing/encouraging off-leash dog activity in designated areas of our beautiful open spaces.
Organization:

Commenter: Lindsey Sheehy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5588 **Comment Id:** 363971 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who regularly takes advantage of the few spaces we have available for off leash recreation, I find it concerning that the promise that was made in the 1979 Pet Policy is being threatened. The GGNRA was created as a multi-recreational area for everyone and should be kept as such.
Organization:
Commenter: Colleen A McNulty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5590 **Comment Id:** 363977 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please reconsider the proposed changes to offleash access at Ft. Funston, Crissy Field, and all the other affected areas. They have been offleash for decades and have provided, and continue to provide, wonderful and much-needed recreational opportunities for residents of the densely populated Bay Area and their dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5604 **Comment Id:** 363990 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When the GGNRA was created in 1972, Dog Walking was already a long standing use of the lands that were turned over to the park. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, and as such this specific recreational use and part of the San Francisco Bay culture - and this use must continue indefinitely.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5636 **Comment Id:** 364054 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There idea was for the land to be a "National Recreational Area" not a Nation Park or Monument. They did not wont the area to be built up like Southern California with roads, houses and businesses. The premise is and was for the land to be used by the people, including pets, horses and other recreational activities! They have always supported the current dog policy as it is today.
Organization:
Commenter: Aran T Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5676 **Comment Id:** 364111 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: People have been responsibly walking their dogs both on and off leash in this area for decades. Dog walking, and being out enjoying the Rancho, has brought our community together and has actually been beneficial to the area by providing waste cans and bags, and facilitated communication and resolving of issues that arise in the open space (fallen trees, lost dogs or people, illegal dirt biking, etc)

Organization: Montara

Commenter: Nancy E Wilder **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5740 **Comment Id:** 364206 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In 1972 the beaches were given to the public by SF congress, and as you know in 1979 the beaches and trails were designed for public use with dogs in the plans. The notion that the these parks not allow dogs off leash juxtaposes the initial planning of these parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex M Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5815 **Comment Id:** 364360 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA was created as a "National Recreation Area" rather than a "National Park" with the understanding that the broad recreational uses in place in the 1970's for urban Bay Area residents would be continued. Please keep this promise to Bay Area residents.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate Clayton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6068 **Comment Id:** 365298 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA was given jurisdiction over this areas under the promise/agreement that the area was to be used for public recreation in a highly dense urban environment and the measures mentioned in the new draft dog management plan do not align with those wishes.

Organization:

Commenter: Kiley M Nichols **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365753 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sweeny Ridge/Cattle Hill I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge trail system. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the

Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if a dog is leashed it will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing. Visitor use of Sweeeny Ridge is relativity low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal. Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365754 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A) I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365755 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E) I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to: Lack of

interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the new Devils Slide Trail. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6246 **Comment Id:** 366190 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Contrary to the SEIS, the purpose of the GGNRA is not to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population." Congress created GGNRA as a "Recreation Area" to serve the reasonable recreational needs of Bay Area households in this densely populated, urban environment. Walking one's dog off-leash is a reasonable recreational need and has been throughout modern history.

Organization:

Commenter: Rhonda Vitanye **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6271 **Comment Id:** 366374 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Currently off-leash dog usage is in very few sites of the GGNRA and on very few acres. Considering how there are so many areas dogs aren't allowed in which species are able to live untouched by dogs, the GGNRA should support Plan A and not reduce the few acres that allow off leash access as it is. These areas are close to neighborhoods who have used these areas for decades.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6608 **Comment Id:** 367148 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: WHEREAS, there are estimated to be up to 100,000 dogs in Marin County, which has a population of approximately 250,000 people, and many have historically exercised

their dogs and themselves on GGRA trails and fire roads; and WHEREAS, of the 52.7 miles of trails and fire roads in the Marin County portion of GGNRA, since 1972 dogs on-leash have been allowed on an estimated 24.2 miles of trails and fire roads, and dogs under voice control (off-leash) have been allowed on an estimated additional 16.1 miles of trails and fire roads; and

Organization: Marin County Board of Supervisors

Commenter: Kathrin Sears **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6655 **Comment Id:** 368246 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please allow off leash dog walking to continue in designated areas of the Golden Gate Recreation Area (GGNRA), most especially Crissy Field/Beach. Areas for off leash dog walking are described in the 10 page July 8, 1996 compendium developed after careful study, by Superintendent Brian O'Neil. The total area designated for off leash dog walking in Mr. O'Neil's 10 page compendium, is less than 1/2 of one percent of the 75,000 acres in the GGNRA. The Park Service has over thirty-six years of data to support the position already taken by its previous Superintendent, Mr. O'Neil. An on leash requirement would contradict promises made in 1979 and 1996 by the Park Service for the continuation off leash dog walking in specified areas of the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: William R Kales **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1137 **Comment Id:** 368740 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth B Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1138 **Comment Id:** 368746 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Organization:

Commenter: Mario Yovkov **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6685 **Comment Id:** 369009 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Additionally, the first GGNRA Superintendent William J. Whalen made specific promises to San Francisco voters that the new NRA would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should they vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369139 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: While composing a list of enumerated recreational activities contemplated for the new urban park would be virtually impossible, legislative history reveals what Congress meant by "needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment." "It is a well-recognized principle of statutory construction that contemporaneous interpretations of dated legislation are ordinarily given considerable deference when its meaning is later questioned." (National Rifle Association of America v. Potter 628 F. Supp. 903, 911 (D.C. Dist. Col. 1986).) In addition to sun bathing, picnicking, horse riding, swimming, hiking, and fishing, offleash dog walking was specifically addressed during Congressional hearings.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

LU2000 Other Agencies Policies and mandates Regarding Dog Management (Substantive)

1. Because of the restrictive dog policies systemwide in NPS, commenters spent more time in BLM lands, where regulations are less stringent.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 142 **Comment Id:** 346307 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Additionally, I think it is sad that such strong limits are placed on dogs across the national park system. I am a strong advocate for the National Park System and a supporter of Wilderness areas as well as other natural resource designations. But sadly because of the strong restrictions on dogs I am unable to consider them as vacation options. We end up spending more time in national forest land or BLM lands where the restrictions are less stringent.

Organization:

Commenter: Christian Knuetter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters made suggestions for the GGNRA based on the management practices and policies of other areas and agencies. These included having a carry-leash policy, not fencing ROLA areas or adding woodchips, implementing dog protection controls, and making sure specific sites includes dog walking to address a need where adjacent lands did not allow this use.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 317 **Comment Id:** 350571 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In April of 2013 the perennially dog friendly East Bay Regional Park District's Board voted unanimously to amend Ordinance 38 adding significant controls and limitations for dogs and their owners accessing the EBRPD's system. The basis for this ruling was public safety and environmental preservation. I ask that the National Park Service at least rise to the level of EBRPD's action.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 435 **Comment Id:** 351366 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Comments specific to Pedro Point Headlands: There is also multiple hiking parks managed by the county within the city of Pacifica (i.e. San Pedro Valley County Park) where dogs are not allowed at all so an alternative is needed where people can walk their dogs on longer trails as reported overwhelmingly by previous public comments.

Organization:

Commenter: Samuel Casillas **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 825 **Comment Id:** 351407 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, on some open space trails (not GGNRA),there is a CARRY LEASH policy. If people carry leashes for their dogs, people who object to a dog's behavior can ask the owner to put the dog on leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Laurie Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4139 **Comment Id:** 362072 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There are fewer and fewer areas for off-leash since the City & County of SF instituted its then new dog policy a few years ago which basically relegates dogs to small fenced-in areas around the city with wood chips placed on the surface (splinters). I view this covering with wood chips - - and perhaps the SF Health Department should also - - as a health hazard as it concentrates urine and feces and opportunity for diseases to spread. The dogs, their owners, and children are basically playing in a cesspool. Playing fetch just brings the filth into the dogs mouths with possibility of transmission to humans. In addition these areas become dust bowls in the summer and mud bowls in the winter due to the concentrated use. I have witnessed Corona Heights park near my home succumb to the concentration issue where prior to fencing the off-leash area vegetation flourished, and the now fenced-in off-leash area is a wasteland of feces- and urine-ridden wood chips covering the surface area.
Organization:
Commenter: William J Harter **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2595 **Comment Id:** 359134 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Redwood Park in the East Bay Regional Park System and Carmel Beach (Carmel, CA) are very good examples that off-leash can work. It is important for dogs to have the freedom to run, play, and socialize. I understand that there are sensitive areas that need to be protected, but there also needs to be areas where the millions of dog owners, who are responsible, can enjoy the outdoors with their loved ones (dogs!).
Organization:
Commenter: Janet Alexander **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4224 **Comment Id:** 362234 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: On page 31 the SEIS cites the use of "Point Isabel Regional Shoreline, which is a state park area managed by East Bay Regional Park District and one of the most heavily used dog parks in the country." but fails to examine any of the successes that are so characteristic of

this park, a potential framework for GGNRA dog management.

Organization:

Commenter: G K Webb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Commenters made suggestions on the analysis of adjacent areas in the SEIS. These included adding a better discussion of the areas and how these areas determined policies and warned visitors, a re-analysis of the alternatives given the problems of off-leash dogs in adjacent areas, and a correction of the language about policies in other areas.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368400 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS mentions the dog policies of National Parks, California State Parks, and other parks or open spaces of counties, municipalities, or other local entities. This section would be much more useful: 1) if there was some discussion about in what proportion of parks and other open space areas entities ban off-leash dog walking and what type of risk assessment led to those policies, and 2) if in those entities where off-leash activity is allowed, what warnings and rules for visitors entering off-leash areas are operative. Such a survey would provide a much better context to proposed dog management alternatives in relation to how the issue has been handled by other entities than by simply mentioning policies of those different entities.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368401 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My initial survey suggested that most parks that allow off-leash dogs have enclosed "dog parks". Most parks that allow off-leash dog play activity provide specific warnings to visitors about the risks involved in entering an off-leash dog zone. There is frequently mention that the park or other entity cannot guarantee the safety of visitors. Since GGNRA is proposing to allow off-leash dogs on some GGNRA beaches and in mixed use areas, the EIS needs to explain how and why NPS thinks it can overcome the problems of off-leash dog activity cited by the other entities while attaining its stated goal of minimizing conflicts related to dog use by providing a variety of safe, high quality visitor use experiences.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 4005 **Comment Id:** 368801 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The survey of other areas ranges from sloppy to inaccurate. For example, on page 32, the SDEIS states: "Seattle, Washington. Dogs are allowed to roam off leash at 11 of the 400 parks and recreation areas in the Seattle metro area. Although dogs are allowed on leash in most other park areas, they are not allowed on beaches, play areas, or organized athletic fields.

Owners are responsible for waste removal. Fines are implemented for leash and waste-removal violations (Seattle Parks and Recreation 2009, 1, 3)." This statement is incorrect. In fact, Seattle does allow dogs on beaches (Magnuson Park), as does the City of Vancouver (there is a dog beach on False Creek/English Bay next to the Burrard Bridge). In fact, this information is readily available on both the City of Seattle's and City of Vancouver's websites. Vancouver parks' website starts with the statement: "Dogs are welcome in all of Vancouver's parks and must be on leash unless they are in a designated dog off-leash area" and shows photos where dogs can be off-leash at various beaches and waterbodies. Although these areas are smaller than San Francisco's extensive saltwater beaches, if such easily obtained information is incorrect in the SDEIS, it raises serious questions of the accuracy - or more likely - bias and lack of objectivity in its preparation.

Exemption 5

Organization:

Commenter: Kenneth S Weiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

LU3000 Land Use: Dog Parks Provided by San Francisco and Other Municipalities (Substantive)

1. **San Francisco and surrounding municipalities provide adequate areas for off-leash dog recreation. Some commenters noted that there are many options for dogs, but there are not many other options for wildlife.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 338956 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are more off leash dog parks in San Francisco than several other major cities combined. There are many options for people who want to have their dogs off leash, but there are not many options for the endangered species which we must protect and preserve for future generations.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2332 **Comment Id:** 357807 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are two enormous dog parks that I know of in Southern Marin - - one in Mill Valley and another in Tiburon. People can throw balls for their dogs there. It's not like the GGNRA is the only place to recreate with a dog in this area-that argument is just nonsense.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5046 **Comment Id:** 362111 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are already over 300 acres of off-leash dog parks in San Francisco. This is according to a website operated by dog lovers. Most of the ones listed below do not require leashes, and the rule is not observed in the two that do say "leash required."

Organization:

Commenter: Thomas W Metz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5606 **Comment Id:** 364005 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are plenty of City parks in San Francisco that allow off-leash dogs. There is no need to turn the GGNRA into another dog run.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen A Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5612 **Comment Id:** 364009 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are PLENTY of places for dogs to be off-leash in SF. There are much fewer places for native plants and animals to exist in relative peace, so I'm all for less off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA. While not a dog owner, I love dogs, but let's remember they are dogs. Not kids. Not people. And there are a large number of irresponsible dog owners out there who can't be trusted to maintain control of their dogs
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4256 **Comment Id:** 368472 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Municipalities adjacent to GGNRA lands have ample resources to provide and maintain dedicated off-leash dog play areas, as these are among the wealthiest counties in the nation. It is not difficult to imagine that if presented with an elimination of off-leash privileges within the GGNRA, local municipalities will realize their own resourcefulness and capability to meet the demands of their citizenry.
Organization:
Commenter: Matthew & JoAnn Zlatunich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

2. **Dog parks provided in San Francisco and other areas are not sufficient for the dog walking population. Commenters felt that these dog parks are already overcrowded, worn down, and dangerous; fenced areas cause aggression and are not satisfying to dogs or dog walkers.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 501 **Comment Id:** 351817 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: This new plan would essentially keep me restricted to dog parks such as Doboce, Dolores, Alamo Square and Corona Heights. So whats the big deal right? Other than Corona, none of these are fenced in and are surrounded by traffic. Luckily our dog is old enough to understand the boundaries of these parks, however as a puppy we were reluctant to let her off leash and the times she did step out of bounds were terrifying. Also these parks tend to be over crowded with people other dogs and homeless encampments. They show the wear and tear of use which the parks of the ggnra do not. We have to keep an eye out for our wondering pup making sure she doesn't get into the mud which is full of giarida, peoples pick-nicks or mess with the homeless.
Organization:
Commenter: Kevin Taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4139 **Comment Id:** 362072 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are fewer and fewer areas for off-leash since the City & County of SF instituted its then new dog policy a few years ago which basically relegates dogs to small fenced-in areas around the city with wood chips placed on the surface (splinters). I view this covering with wood chips - - and perhaps the SF Health Department should also - - as a health hazard as it concentrates urine and feces and opportunity for diseases to spread. The dogs, their owners, and children are basically playing in a cesspool. Playing fetch just brings the filth into the dogs mouths with possibility of transmission to humans. In addition these areas become dust bowls in the summer and mud bowls in the winter due to the concentrated use. I have witnessed Corona Heights park near my home succumb to the concentration issue where prior to fencing the off-leash area vegetation flourished, and the now fenced-in off-leash area is a wasteland of feces- and urine-ridden wood chips covering the surface area.

Organization:

Commenter: William J Harter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5110 **Comment Id:** 362192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Without these areas, San Francisco dog guardians and their canine companions will be limited to city parks. While some have dog-play areas, they are small, cramped, poorly maintained, and very unfriendly to the many dogs who thrive in open areas. This is not a reasonable option.

Organization:

Commenter: Lauren Hauptman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5280 **Comment Id:** 362871 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Unfortunately, Lafayette Park can barely accommodate the high volume of dogs it receives daily, as evidenced by the grass being completely run down in the off leash dog area. I am certain that the situation at Lafayette Park would worsen if the off leash areas of the GGNRA were further restricted.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane I Gaito **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5314 **Comment Id:** 362955 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I never take my dog to fenced parks because they are DANGEROUS. Nervous owners with nervous dogs are attracted to fenced areas because their dogs are not behaved and the likelihood of a fight is much higher. Attacks are common in fenced areas that serve as bullpens.

Organization:

Commenter: Tracey Gold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5852 **Comment Id:** 364413 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Without beach access the only area dog owners can let their dogs roam free also places them at grave risk for a large part of the year: The majority of non-beach dog parks I have visited in the Bay Area are heavily overrun with foxtails from the late spring to early autumn months. Allowing dogs to roam free in these environments puts their health and life at risk.
Organization:
Commenter: George Theodoris **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6218 **Comment Id:** 366139 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are too many sport fields that don't allow any dogs and too few dog parks with wood chips that are so small a dog can barely run around... it is quite sad to see such little love for a state claims to be so dog friendly.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. The dog management plan would cause adverse impacts on city dog parks as dog walkers look for places to walk their dogs. Commenters noted that the SEIS did not adequately address the impact of the influx of dogs in these areas.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1037 **Comment Id:** 351467 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I live in Bernal Heights just blocks away from one of the few off leash city parks in San Francisco. The park is already very well frequented, and I dare not imagine the devastating environmental impact your plan would have on our park. Simply put, if you restrict dog access the way you outline it in Alternative F, the dogs that frequent GGRA land are not going to magically disappear, they are going to have to be walked somewhere, and the city simply doesnt have the infrastructure to handle that influx of dogs in its city parks. The parks would be ruined, and recreation really would become inaccessible to non-dog owners who werent frequenting GGRA sites anyways and are now unable to enjoy city parks. Not to mention the fuel emissions of those responsible dog owners who would decide to seek friendly trails in East Bay Regional Parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Julie L **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1374 **Comment Id:** 352412 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I hope you will consider the impact on San Francisco and Marin if off leash

dog walking is banned in the GGNRA. Banning or further limiting off leash dogs will have a significant negative impact on San Francisco and Marin parks. And recreation areas At least 10,000 dogs visit the GGNRA every day. San Francisco city parks are much, much smaller than the GGNRA and will be unable to absorb the impact of all those dogs if they are forced out of the GGNRA. The negative impact on parks and other recreation areas in San Francisco and Marin far outweighs any potential negative impacts in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1586 **Comment Id:** 353155 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: By restricting the use of these lands, you are forcing dog owners to flock to smaller urban parks, which will cause overcrowding and congestion in the neighborhoods these parks are in. We live in the outer sunset and during the federal furlough when Fort Funston was closed, we saw Pine Lake Park inside Stern Grove get jam-packed with dogs & people - - just awful.

Organization:

Commenter: Vivian Sakovich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1893 **Comment Id:** 354483 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I also fear how crowded our dog parks will become. Our local parks are too small for proper exercise and, with more dogs pushed into them, may also cause further aggression due to crowded conditions. It will also undoubtedly lead to more spread of contagious diseases, such as giardia and parvo, which are already all too prevalent in San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Beverly Ulbrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357066 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. The public and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors requested this analysis in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, albeit much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The GGNRA has not adequately studied the dispersion effect of its plan on local communities, neighborhoods and residential areas. These include parking, traffic congestion, driving patterns and increased miles traveled to reach dog-friendly areas

Organization:

Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4882 **Comment Id:** 361687 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Restricting off-leash activities to small defined areas causes many problems, including dog fights since the pooches lack adequate personal space. In addition, small "dog parks" generally force needless congestion causing excessive terrain damage due to non-dispersed foot and paw traffic.

Organization:

Commenter: Kurt N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. Commenters noted that dog walkers already overrun dog parks, as well as other areas within city parks, and that there would not be an impact on dog walkers, as they already use these areas in non-compliance for off-leash dog walking. Commenters also noted that this makes the opportunity to find recreational activities without dogs in these areas difficult.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 761 **Comment Id:** 353162 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog Owners do not obey the rules anyway - Look at ANY park in San Francisco. When I last visited Pine Lake Park, SF, I was driven away by off-leash, out-of-control dogs. As I am elderly, I did not try to confront anyone. I just left.

Organization:

Commenter: Travis Hails **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1848 **Comment Id:** 354347 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly agree with the idea of this plan. However, from what I can see, there is no mention of Stern Grove Park anywhere. I live in the area, and I cannot take my kid to Stern Grove, because, despite the fact that this park has its own dog play area, the off-leash dogs are everywhere - kids playground included. This is not safe. My concern is that after the other city parks become more restricted towards the off-leash dogs, there would be even more off-leash dogs in Stern Grove, which would basically turn it into one huge dog park, neighborhood children be damned. So my suggestion is to try to make off-leash/on-leash restrictions and clear markings a citywide project, to save other parks, and especially Stern Grove, from becoming exclusively dogs playgrounds.

Organization:

Commenter: Maria Belilovskaya **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5486 **Comment Id:** 363349 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have built part of my community around the other dog owners and dog lovers who gather on the beach every morning to watch their dogs romp together over a cup of hot coffee from the Beach Hut Cafe. Without vital community hubs like this, dog owners and dog

walkers will be crammed into tiny neighborhood parks. I imagine residents around these parks will feel this overcrowdedness as well.

Organization:

Commenter: monica tang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368116 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The idea that dogs will crowd interior parks when the GGNRA restricts off-leashes use is LUDICRIOUS! Dog's owners already dominate public parks, fields, courts, slopes; this practice will not change. Owners go to beaches and to parks with their dogs strictly at the CONVENIENCE to owners, not the preferences of dogs. Parks are convenient for the daily toileting of dogs... beaches are a nice but not necessary ventures. Parks have always and will always take the brunt of this misuse.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In San Francisco, leash laws are almost never enforced in any of the City parks, and many parks, such as Pine Lake Park, are defacto dog parks. For San Francisco residents wishing to pursue an outdoor activity outside the presence of off-leash dogs, there are extremely limited possibilities for enjoying the outdoor environment. The EIS should discuss the limited options for outdoor space not just for dog walkers but for all visitor groups, especially visitor groups especially vulnerable to safety risk from off leash dogs, including: children; the elderly; the physically disabled; equestrians; hand gliders; joggers; etc.; and those who wish to have an outdoor experience without being harassed or disturbed by off leash dogs, such as hikers and naturalists.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368438 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This section is written with apparently zero knowledge of the actual situation of off-leash dog use of San Francisco City Parks. Although official policy limits off-leash dog use to certain designated areas within specific parks, in actual fact there is almost no enforcement of this policy. For example, Pine Lake/Stern Grove is essentially a dog park. All of the negative consequences discussed in the SEIS in the event of dog management in GGNRA more restrictive to off-leash dog walking are already occurring in Pine Lake/Stern Grove, for example. The authors of the EIS need to be informed that most off-leash dog walkers in San Francisco ignore restrictions on off-leash dog walking in City parks. In addition, this section also needs to cover the impact of various alternatives on other user groups, comprising approximately 90% of GGNRA visitors, who might need to seek alternative areas outside of GGNRA based on dog

management alternatives that fail to protect their safety or visitor experience from off-leash dog activity.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 226 **Comment Id:** 350147 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SF city parks are not adequate and are limited, we need GGNRA open spaces preserved for off-leash use

Organization:

Commenter: keith ruoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 253 **Comment Id:** 350360 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The alternatives are not reasonable, as dogs are not allowed in state beaches, and most other city parks are very small, so Fort Funston is one of the last voice control recreational areas left.

Organization:

Commenter: David Hecht **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1007 **Comment Id:** 351415 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Even more importantly, the SEIS does not address the environmental and social impact on small, neighborhood parks in cities like San Francisco next to the GGNRA. Because the GGNRA is located immediately adjacent to one of the most densely populated areas in the United States (San Francisco), it provides much needed recreational open space for Bay Area residents. If that open space is lost to recreational access, people and their dogs will move to the much smaller city parks and they will not be able to absorb the hundreds or thousands of people with dogs each day that will be kicked out of the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1100 **Comment Id:** 351637 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. I am sure that places like Stern Grove will be inundated with dogs if the preferred alternative is implemented.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea L Buffa **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1177 **Comment Id:** 351913 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: According to official comments by SF Dog: there hasnt been any consideration of how city parks will be impacted by the proposed new plan restricting 90% of whats available now. Should the restriction occur, all the SF city parks would be deluged with hundreds of dogs. This would ruin the already crowded city park experience for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Lancaster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1189 **Comment Id:** 351951 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, District 4 contains only two off-leash dog play areas managed by the Recreation and Park Department in its boundaries, both of which are located in Stern Grove, over one mile away from Ocean Beach. Without an adequate analysis of how closing 80% of Ocean Beach to dogs would impact our City dog play areas and the maintenance load of our City departments, we cannot support the Preferred Alternative.

Organization: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Commenter: Eric and Katy Mar and Tang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1189 **Comment Id:** 351952 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Similarly, District 1 contains three off-leash dog play areas that are managed by the Recreation and Park Department and would also, potentially, suffer negative impacts should the Preferred Alternative be implemented.

Organization: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Commenter: Eric and Katy Mar and Tang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1206 **Comment Id:** 351979 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We visit other parks in SF but nothing compares to these two areas. Plus all the other parks can't / won't be able to handle the increase in usage if these areas are closed! Most Dog parks in SF are already getting overwhelmed, and this is only going to exacerbate this issue.

Organization:

Commenter: B Evans **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1214 **Comment Id:** 352003 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are over 100,000 dogs in San Francisco and if the current dog rules are changed to be more restrictive to non-professional dog walkers it will force many people that currently walk their dogs in the GGNRA to turn to city parks. The city parks do not have the capacity for the increased dog walking usage.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1217 **Comment Id:** 352013 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The smaller off leash places like Stern Grove and Corona Heights will start to get flooded with people and get very overcrowded so that these too will have problems with erosion from people and their dogs whether they are on or off the leash.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1242 **Comment Id:** 352053 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Limiting the areas that already allow dogs will have the unintended consequence of inundating our city parks with dogs (both on and off-leash).
Organization:
Commenter: Stephanie Karim **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1287 **Comment Id:** 352245 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption
Organization:
Commenter: Natalie Tondelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1300 **Comment Id:** 352263 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeff Osteen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1286 **Comment Id:** 352270 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: To the contrary, confining people with dogs to small areas is going to cause

degradation and health problems as well both for the dogs and their owners. Psychologically such confinement smacks of a depressing setting more akin to dog and dog owner concentration camps. Already the few off leash City owned parks are overcrowded, showing wear and resulting in people not being willing to go to them where they are packed in. I can point to Corona Heights and Upper Douglass Dog Park as prime examples.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard D Carrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1322 **Comment Id:** 352309 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a San Francisco resident I am also concerned about the impact the Preferred Alternative, if implemented, will have on City's dog parks. Given San Francisco's size there are a limited number of off-leash dog parks in San Francisco, and in my opinion none as beautiful or as enjoyable as Fort Funston.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan A Garbuio **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1371 **Comment Id:** 352407 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Reducing the areas where dogs are free to be dogs will make it difficult for dog-owners in the Bay Area to exercise their dogs (and themselves), and this will result in (a) overcrowding of existing dog runs in the City parks, and (b) increased dog aggression since they will not be as tired and happy as they currently are.

Organization:

Commenter: Leora Goren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1399 **Comment Id:** 352442 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you restrict the access to off leash areas, this will push dog walkers to go to local parks which will be a burden for the city. It also might put many dog walkers out of business.

Organization: Joan 4 Pets

Commenter: Joan L Mapou **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1421 **Comment Id:** 352523 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are over 100,000 dogs in San Francisco and they need a place to exercise. San Francisco has given a significant amount of its beaches and natural lands to GGNRA jurisdiction and current San Francisco parks are not able to handle the influx of dogs that would happen if dog walking was limited in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1447 **Comment Id:** 352575 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The report includes a section about monitoring-based management strategy. That strategy includes monitoring the number of dogs and dog walkers, among other items. Has any monitoring of the number of dogs (in general, not only for commercial dog walkers) been done as part of the research for the plan? If only 25 dogs use Fort Funston on a day, it's not a problem to relocate those dogs to other city parks. But what happens when hundreds of dogs are relocated? Or thousands? The potential for aggressive incidents increases dramatically if a large number of dogs are relocated to a smaller area.
Organization:
Commenter: Gina Luzzi **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1447 **Comment Id:** 352578 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And I would bet that people are more likely to change the location where they take their dog (if the final plan requires it) than they are to change the time of day. Many of us work and have a set window for going to Fort Funston. So, if the plan restricts off-leash areas in the GGNRA, not only will a lot more dogs be transferred to city parks, but they likely won't be dispersed throughout the hours of the day in an even manner.
Organization:
Commenter: Gina Luzzi **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 620 **Comment Id:** 352751 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The cities involved simply need more numerous satisfactory areas where dogs can run free. It's a problem. There isn't space for wildlife. It's a big problem. Too many people. Why aren't we discussing that?
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah Hummingbird **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1520 **Comment Id:** 352980 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If areas where dogs can be allowed are restricted, it makes those areas less safe for others, while overcrowding the remaining parks. Restrictions in the GGNRA will inevitably push the dog population into the city parks in larger numbers. This seems counterproductive on every level.
Organization:
Commenter: Rupa Bose **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1532 **Comment Id:** 353025 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And finally, As my own dogs age they prefer a smaller city park experience and if the GGNRA areas become even more restricted our city parks will become over run.
Organization: Doggie Do Right Dog Training
Commenter: Sue Minsuk **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1608 **Comment Id:** 353192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1777 **Comment Id:** 353196 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: And finally, we would have to seek out altunative off leash areas further away from San Francisco so our family could get some exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: Dean Rizzi **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1636 **Comment Id:** 353231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1639 **Comment Id:** 353236 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If the dog management plan is adopted, Marins estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.
Organization:
Commenter: Nina P Le Baron **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1650 **Comment Id:** 353250 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I worry that, if enacted, it will create a series of so called "dispersion" problems such as traffic and over crowding at the few remaining places where people are legally allowed to exercise their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Irene Gustafson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1655 **Comment Id:** 353479 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is vital that families, which often include dogs, continue to have access to our local open spaces and park lands, and not just to a tiny few areas which may be at a distance and become overcrowded as a result of your restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Bell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1657 **Comment Id:** 353486 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you restrict usage as proposed, then the local dog parks will become inundated. Where else will dog owners be able to go to let their critters romp about?

Organization:

Commenter: Aubrey L Freedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1669 **Comment Id:** 353518 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If the GGNRA restrictions take effect, I can forsee overcrowding in nearby city parks, causing NEW issues with dogs due to the overcrowding.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Ceisel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1673 **Comment Id:** 353523 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Being in an urban environment like this, packing the huge number of dogs that live in this city into its streets limiting off leash running/exercise areas the way you propose, is a recipe for disaster. you'll have under-exercised dogs in tight envioronments, and i can assure you the beautiful areas of this city that make things worth it, will not get the use they're getting now. The quality of life for all in this city will decrease - i have no doubt of that.

Organization:

Commenter: Cristina & Llop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1735 **Comment Id:** 353537 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Stacey Dirzuweit **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1942 **Comment Id:** 353541 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I expect that if your proposed changes are implemented at Fort Funston, we will see Stern Grove flooded with dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Ruben Garcia **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4113 **Comment Id:** 353607 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: The proposed restrictions will also have a negative impact on quality of life throughout the city as the increasingly limited dog friendly areas become overcrowded and inaccessible.

Organization:

Commenter: kristin hinkle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Comment Text: But where will all the dogs go, if not into the National Park lands we love soooooo much (and which is supported by our tax dollars)? Riiiight - dog parks! Put the problems out of the GGNRA and into the local, municipality-owned parks sprinkled around the County.Packing us all into the tiny municipal dog parks that are available will only create BIGGER problems!

Organization:

Commenter: David E Gurley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1720 **Comment Id:** 353693 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Restricting access will cause overcrowding in our cities' parks and take away outdoor recreation access for thousands of dog owning households in our area.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen Cederlof **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1756 **Comment Id:** 353741 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRAs original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan FAILS to do.

Organization:

Commenter: Catherine Foreman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4343 **Comment Id:** 353832 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Eliminating access to places like Ft. Funston, Crissy Field and Baker Beach would cause severe over-crowding in other places like local parks and small enclosed dog parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Julia Mason **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1796 **Comment Id:** 353933 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheryl R Owyang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1884 **Comment Id:** 354438 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to voice my opinion to oppose the GGNRA's revised dog plan. I fear that by placing restrictions on what have traditionally been dog-friendly spaces, smaller spaces such as city parks will now have to accommodate an influx of dogs and may lead to more conflict between dog owners and non-dog owners. As San Francisco is a city with a robust dog population, it seems unwise to greatly reduce the amount of available recreation space, especially as it construes such a small amount of the overall GGNRA land holdings.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Elefterakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5182 **Comment Id:** 354487 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: if these new rules are implemented, hundreds more dogs will flood into already crowded city parks, and the results will not be good for SF or any other area.

Organization:
Commenter: val ornoy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5201 **Comment Id:** 354490 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: If these new rules are implemented, hundreds more dogs will flood into already crowded city parks, and the results will not be good for SF or any other area.
Organization:
Commenter: Alexis Stricker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1969 **Comment Id:** 354631 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: What studies have been done to understand the impact to Golden Gate Park and other small parks when this walking area is reduced?
Organization:
Commenter: Nancy Valente **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1976 **Comment Id:** 354638 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If this ban goes forward, where are the dogs supposed to go? The parks are already crowded as it is, imagine how much more crowded they'll become when they have less places to go.
Organization:
Commenter: Sasha Moyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2657 **Comment Id:** 354807 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We will be forced to go to small, cramped dog parks that, if this law passes, will be completely overcrowded. I believe you have to keep in mind the importance of a dog needing space to be a dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Jami M Nadzam **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2658 **Comment Id:** 354817 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The only place they will be able to go in San Francisco county will be McLaren Park. How will 3000/dogs a day impact that tiny 30 acres? We need more areas not less. If an are is over used, then you need a plan to rotate acreage. You need a system like in skin resorts of hard, easy, moderate places, you need to teach people what works and doesn't work for hiking. Keeping dogs off trails is NOT the answer.

Organization:
Commenter: Carolyn Erdman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2890 **Comment Id:** 355022 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because my dog uses off-leash trails 3 times a week and would be confined to a very small beach if this goes through. Reducing the area she has to play puts her at greater risk for being attacked by another dog. My neighbor's dog was recently killed by another dog in a small dog park. I feel this could have been prevented if the dogs had more room to play.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Sarah Fruy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2893 **Comment Id:** 355028 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is also going to impact city parks, because if this proposal passes hundreds upon hundreds of people and their dogs are going to flood places like Maclaren Park and Golden Gate Park. I've seen what happens when too many dogs are in a confined space, and I'm also worried about the potential serious accidents it will cause should this happen.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Chantelle Karl **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2902 **Comment Id:** 355184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred A.lter.native. This analysis was requested by public com ment.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: james white **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2921 **Comment Id:** 355212 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because these places you want to ban are the best for our dog and we always have fun and good exercise at them. The smaller dog parks are like prison yards and can be congested and dangerous. We have never had a problem at these GGNRA parks and always pick up after our dog
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: John Damario **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2947 **Comment Id:** 355255 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Being able to enjoy nature's beauty with our 4 legged family members is one of the reasons I live here, and I hope you will consider the importance of this access to residents and also how much undue stress this plan will add to city dog parks and neighborhoods.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Kimberly Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2968 **Comment Id:** 355282 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: He is a water dog, and needs to swim. This plan will make it nearly impossible for my dog to swim and will make other city dog parks over crowded. This is unfair and u net hical!

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Britt Fohrman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2979 **Comment Id:** 355306 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We will be forced to go to small, cramped dog parks that, if this law passes, will be com pletely overcrowded.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jami Nadzam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3893 **Comment Id:** 355642 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog needs space to run just like humans do, it would make the already very crowded city parks even more crowded!

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: daniela jagle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4182 **Comment Id:** 355950 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it is too restrictive and will drive dog owners to the already overcrowded city parks of San Francisco. We live in a small condo with no yard, so if it weren't for the GGNRA parks, we would be limited to taking him to small city parks that are already filled with homeless people and their waste. If the GGNRAs became restricted from dog access, it would create major over-crowding in the other city-run parks in the city and cause a ripple effect impacting all of the people visiting these parks for recreation, picnics et al.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Lynne Riedesel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4473 **Comment Id:** 356011 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred A.lter.native. This analysis was requested by public com ment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Theresa Gaydon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2644 **Comment Id:** 356980 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Ft Funston and other off-leash dog areas must remain open for recreational use - - including off-leash dogs. The plan as stated is restrictive, does not support the recreational use of OUR land and puts a tremendous burden on city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Lori Redford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2648 **Comment Id:** 356988 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I was just wondering where are we going to walk our dogs off-leash if this passes. If everyone has to go to the small, enclosed off-leash areas around the city, then one is asking for an awful amount of trouble...both between dogs and owners

Organization:

Commenter: Mark Sedgwick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2674 **Comment Id:** 357035 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: These are very valuable areas to us as responsible dog owners living in the city of San Francisco. Please do not take away these highly valued off-leash locations - with the large population of dogs living in the city, this would put immense pressure on the few off-leash city parks that would be left to accommodate us.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary G Keppler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2729 **Comment Id:** 357147 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The one other place in San Mateo County of walk off-leash (Esplanade Beach in Pacifica) is now almost permanently inaccessible due to cliff erosion. Hence the NPS decides now is the right time to ban off leash walking everywhere else too?!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2738 **Comment Id:** 357156 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The closing of more GGNRA lands to dog owners will force them to walk their dogs only in park lands managed by cities and counties, making these areas unacceptably crowded and difficult to manage. This is surely unacceptable for local jurisdictions, many of which were the grantors of the land GGNRA currently manages!

Organization:

Commenter: Carol J Arnold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2753 **Comment Id:** 357195 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Yet, the Plan allows only extremely confined areas permitting dogs in the GGNRA that will soon become severely overcrowded, which will result in serious congestion in nearby neighborhood dog parks. San Francisco's dog parks are already limited, and off-leash areas are particularly scarce. If guardians and their dogs are displaced from the GGNRA and forced to relocate to the city's dog parks, this overcrowding will become increasingly problematic and potentially dangerous. These negative impacts will be felt by individuals both with and without pets, as well as the already overburdened City of San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department.

Organization: San Francisco SPCA

Commenter: Brandy Kuentzel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2762 **Comment Id:** 357383 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are currently more families with dogs than with children residing in San Francisco, and eliminating the GGNRA off-leash areas will seriously over tax the limited city park space available in San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Dawn Silberstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2807 **Comment Id:** 357527 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: They could take their dogs to city parks which are small and would be ruined by the increased traffic of all the people and dogs who currently use the GGNRA. The impact of dogs on these parks could be devastating.

Organization:
Commenter: Mary Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357575 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption.
Organization:
Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3086 **Comment Id:** 357894 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not force us into small neighborhood parks where overcrowding will be a real issue.
Organization:
Commenter: Brian F Bleuher **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3097 **Comment Id:** 357898 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The fenced dog run areas are over crowed and too small for multiple animals to fetch effectively with their owners and taking a nun fettered walk is out of the question.
Organization:
Commenter: Gary W Rowbury **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3286 **Comment Id:** 358044 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you take this access away these areas especially Fort Funston people will not be use/appreciated as much. All the dog owner will then go to other areas and overcrowd those parks with their dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Renee Naleppa **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3325 **Comment Id:** 358150 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a San Francisco resident with a dog of my own, I am very concerned that

your restrictive plan will place an undue burden on the City Park system with regard to dog usage.

Organization:

Commenter: Marvin L Lambert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3343 **Comment Id:** 358194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Ian Gover **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3386 **Comment Id:** 358302 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It will limit the distances I can walk to get much needed exercise as most off leash dog areas are very small and will certainly become much more crowded if large expanses like Ocean Beach and Fort Funston are eliminated.

Organization:

Commenter: Wendy J Wald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3484 **Comment Id:** 359155 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not close these wonderful parks to dogs. This will create tremendous over use of the neighborhood parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Amelia M Ross **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3566 **Comment Id:** 359242 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephanie S Palmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3850 **Comment Id:** 359975 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For decades large numbers of dogs have exercised at Fort Funston and Crissy Field. If those areas are cutoff to dogs they will start relying on city parks instead. We don't have to imagine the impact on the city parks if that happens since we saw it first hand two years ago during beach closures.

Organization:

Commenter: Shari M **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4595 **Comment Id:** 361112 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If these policies take effect, the small existing parks that allow dogs will be inundated. There are more dogs in San Franscisco than children. Dogs are adored by this population. How does plan take into account shifting demographics, importance of dogs for human health, and the importance of exercise and time spent with dogs as important paradigm in human health?

Organization:

Commenter: Natalie D DeWitt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4757 **Comment Id:** 361430 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Closing the GGNRA to off-leash walking would have a very negative impact on city parks where off-leash walking and playing is allowed. We often take the dogs to Stern Grove and McLaren Park, and can imagine these areas being overrun with dogs and owners (and professional dog walkers) if Funston and Crissy Field are put off limits.

Organization:

Commenter: Vivian M Walz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4790 **Comment Id:** 361538 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If the misguided and wrong-headed new policy is put in place, an enormous and untenable strain will be put on the city parks in San Francisco. This should not and cannot be allowed to occur.

Organization:

Commenter: Glen Kretmar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4795 **Comment Id:** 361549 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The city parks in San Francisco do not have the capacity to absorb the influx off people and dogs that would occur if dog walking is restricted in the GGNRA.

Organization:
Commenter: Kenji Okamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4798 **Comment Id:** 361556 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: eliminating parks and dog walking area is only gonna congest the parks that we are allowed to walk in. there are way too manny dogs for such a small area. please reconsider.
Organization:
Commenter: mazen kharsa **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4807 **Comment Id:** 361570 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I think it's ridiculous that this is even a topic or issue. We will be forced to overcrowd already overcrowded off leash city parks. Please do not go through with this.
Organization:
Commenter: Meghan Doyle **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4840 **Comment Id:** 361621 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please understand how this alternative will negatively impact not only the open spaces that currently allow off-leash access, but will in turn impact the health of the city's dogs, dog-owners, and crowding in neighborhood parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4887 **Comment Id:** 361705 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My wife and I bring our dog to Crissy Field and Fort Mason regularly, and it is one of the few opportunities our dog has to really run and get the exercise he needs. This is a meaningful and valuable part of our lives in this city, and it is essential in keeping our dog happy and healthy. There is *no way* that we could get him the kind of exercise he needs on leash, and the dog parks, which are fine for daily use, are not a substitute for the kind of safe and vigorous exercise our dog Kid can get in more open spaces.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A T N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4945 **Comment Id:** 361808 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It would also force large numbers of dogs into the small, already crowded city parks to try to exercise. We know that problems occur when too many dogs/people are crowded

into too small a space.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361982 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. The estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves - it passes the buck to towns, cities and the county.
Organization:
Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5063 **Comment Id:** 362145 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is very scary to hear about restricting off leash dog areas! We are dog owners and value all the wonderful places our dogs can go off leash. We are very responsible with our dogs and they deserve fun places to run! Please do not take away the off leash areas in the parks. It will only cause overcrowding at other parks and difficult situations between dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Sue L Rodgerson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5068 **Comment Id:** 362151 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would be very concerned about crowding at other city and county parks that do allow dogs if these GGNRA areas were closed to dogs. The other parks are much smaller and could be easily overwhelmed.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5106 **Comment Id:** 362188 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: the impact of this law will not only impact the overall happiness and well-being of many bay area citizens, but it will also put undue stress on local parks and other areas that dog-owners will have no choice but to rely on for recreation.
Organization:
Commenter: Tara A Medve **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5110 **Comment Id:** 362193 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Small, fenced dog runs are very dangerous for most dogs, and only open park areas - where dogs can easily be distant from dangerous people (and other hazards) are safe. Removing the ONLY open parkland from use by families with dogs puts all San Franciscans - human and canine - in danger.

Organization:

Commenter: Lauren Hauptman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5113 **Comment Id:** 362250 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The impact this policy will have on the city parks and surrounding communities will be catastrophic. Our City Parks are overcrowded already. There are simply not enough dog-friendly areas in the city to handle the canine population. We don't have the infrastructure or the space to expand. Simply put.... they have nowhere to go.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5145 **Comment Id:** 362276 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: She is under voice control and requires time off-leash to obtain the exercise she needs to support her physical and mental health. A dog park or fenced in area does not work. Our dog does not get the exercise she needs in a fenced in area or pen. Being so friendly, she says hello to all the dogs and people at the park, and unless the "right" dog is there, she will stand around and not get any exercise. Also a dog park does not give us, my family, the opportunity to experience and exercise in a beautiful environment, one of the pertinent reasons we chose to live and work in Marin and the San Francisco Bay Area, together.

Organization:

Commenter: Jill Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5183 **Comment Id:** 362513 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Small spaces = aggravated dogs. Closing off GGNRA areas that are traditionally off-leash will lead to overcrowding at MacLaren (which is not easily accessible for everyone); Douglas Park is (still!) not open and also limited in its scope.

Organization:

Commenter: Julia N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5210 **Comment Id:** 362609 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience

children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara Lazarow **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5241 **Comment Id:** 362761 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I fear closure of the most frequented spaces would create a backlash elsewhere in a city which has long been friendly to man and beast, either packing smaller parks or making the city less desirable for those who want to live here
Organization:
Commenter: Amanda Serenyi **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5245 **Comment Id:** 362775 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.
Organization:
Commenter: Frederick R Leach **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5247 **Comment Id:** 362784 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my small, neighborhood parks (I.E. Insert park names here) will be over-run with people and their dogs. Dog owners out of desperation will fill up already crowded dog parks if places like Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Rancho Corral de Tierra are cut off. I do not doubt that dog owners will not only fill the neighborhood parks, but also the baseball fields and school yards because of the lack of exercise space for their dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5273 **Comment Id:** 362852 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: By eliminating 90% o the off-leash areas, all the pet owners, dog walkers, etc will be forced to go to the small local parks., and therefore creating a new problem.
Organization:
Commenter: Lori Pryt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5274 **Comment Id:** 362855 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Forcing people with dogs into fewer and smaller spaces will result in a density of use that will make those spaces unfit for their purpose.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5299 **Comment Id:** 362916 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash walking is extremely beneficial for both pet owner and pet alike. It provides a sense of freedom that is not attainable on city streets or many of the other existing parks in San Francisco. For me personally, it provides my primary source of exercise on a daily basis to hike at Fort Funston with my dogs. There are hundreds of people and their pets that will be displaced from an activity that is and should be available to them. Please consider the impact that it will have on the current and future dog owners as well as the neigbhorhoods and city parks that will see a large increase in dog activity.
Organization:
Commenter: Adam Damico **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5340 **Comment Id:** 362990 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If this plan goes forward witout any apparent accomodation of dog owners it will B) cause a substantial surge in the number of dogs in all the other parks in San Francisco which has no plans to sdress it
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5378 **Comment Id:** 363029 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Ignore what constituents want and watch your smaller parks absorb the 75% dsplaced dogs converge on the smaller parks and still open off-lease areas.
Organization: Private College
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5431 **Comment Id:** 363221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: They have to take their dogs somewhere to exercise them. I foresee many, many people using areas such as small city parks to run their dogs; areas where dogs have either always been banned or only allowed on-leash. Perhaps the powers that be see this as a new revenue source for issuing tickets to such offenders? I also see many more aggressive dog issues as people are forced to use smaller, congested designated dog parks; areas that are frequently

used by owners that are either ignorant of the need, or are just too lazy to provide proper supervision

Organization:

Commenter: Stef Meinhardt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5455 **Comment Id:** 363308 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Has the GGNRA considered what will happen if they ban dogs on all those trails. Where will people take their beloved compainion to run ? Dog parks where there have been so many fights not only from the pent up dogs , but from the owners. I have seen way too many people screaming at each other in those parks. They are toxic places for many reasons.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary Lyons **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5472 **Comment Id:** 363333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan also does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby city parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. But no evidence is given to support either assumption. And if people do move to the city parks, they will be overwhelmed with dogs and their owners, making it an unpleasant and unsafe environment for all city dwellers.

Organization:

Commenter: Kalyn L Chomko **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5489 **Comment Id:** 363359 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This new proposed reduction in off-leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis, especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5499 **Comment Id:** 363878 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Forcing dog owners back into the urban parks, most of which are already over crowded will have a disastrous impact on the quality of time spent for owners and dogs.

Organization: self employed dog trainer

Commenter: Aleen Vorhies **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5501 **Comment Id:** 363883 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have tried the so-called Dog Parks and they are not much but filthy, crowded, dog gulags. Dogs NEED to run - we need to play with our dogs - and we cant accomplish that with all of the restrictions already in place. Please DO NOT restrict us further.
Organization:
Commenter: Suesan E Saucerman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5511 **Comment Id:** 363889 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Not to mention that dog outnumber children in San Francisco, the GGNRA is proposing that the other 90% o people essentially "stack" their dogs on top of one another at the specific parks that sanction. This will create FAR MORE PROBLEMS in the community. As a professional dog walker and business owner since 2005, the negative ramifications far outnumber the reasons to pass along their plan. The analogy can be made for people as it is for dogs, the less "space" in a park, the more agitated people and or dogs may become. Dogs do not have the same reasoning and decision making we do, and therefore dogs will become more territorial and dog fights will become epidemic. Not only dog fighting, and barking creating constant noise problems for local residents, but all fights may lead to humans be injured.
Organization: SuperDog City, LLC
Commenter: Corey M Vitale **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5535 **Comment Id:** 363913 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The few areas close to my home that allow off leash walking are small dingy and dusty fields with nothing interesting to do other than sniff other dogs and romp. Not suprizingly we all lose interest after a few minutes and head home.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah J Murphy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5545 **Comment Id:** 363920 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The impact on the city of San Francisco's budget and parks will be substantial and my supervisor is well aware of these issues and that I vote and pay attention to them
Organization:
Commenter: Melinda Byerley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5546 **Comment Id:** 363927 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5550 **Comment Id:** 363934 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Besides taking a much loved freedom away from dogs and their guardians, citizens of this fair city, disallowing off leash activity in these areas will over crowd city parks, as well as the city shelters with dogs that are unmanageable without getting regular vigorous exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Lindsey Sheehy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5588 **Comment Id:** 363974 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This will adversely affect our city parks and neighborhoods.

Organization:

Commenter: Colleen A McNulty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5601 **Comment Id:** 363986 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please please please leave these few trails that are open to dogs off leash, as they are currently. My family cherishes the times when we take our dog to the beach, hike on oakwood trail and simy enjoy the outdoors with our energetic yellow lab. Dog parks are not the same and provide no satisfaction or exercise for our family.

Organization:

Commenter: Loren Quaglieri **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5625 **Comment Id:** 364025 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need the freedom to run and enjoy the outdoors. Ft. Function as an example would not be used for anything other than a launching pad for wind surfers. It is a shame that people don't see the benefit of the off leash areas instead of crowding the sidewalks of the inner city with dogs on leash. Do not reduce the amount of off leash space.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura J Baker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5647 **Comment Id:** 364066 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog is very small and is not comfortable when we go to the designated gated parks throughout the City. He is overwhelmed with dogs, many of which are aggressive.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5652 **Comment Id:** 364077 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restrictions on areas such as Ft Funston will adversely affect other off leash areas nearby, such as Stern Grove. There is plenty of room for all
Organization: a proud dog owner and voter
Commenter: Laura M Birsinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5654 **Comment Id:** 364079 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dog "parks" are not enough.
Organization:
Commenter: Lauren A Schwartz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5725 **Comment Id:** 364188 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Fort Funston as a dog area is obviously its best use. It offers a wonderful recreation area to dog owners who otherwise are shoved into inadequate and limited corrals.
Organization:
Commenter: chris coghlan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5729 **Comment Id:** 364198 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We rely on these off-leash parks to be able to exercise in areas of natural beauty, and also to keep us from adding to dog-parks that are over-crowded and small.
Organization:
Commenter: Audrey E Zmuda **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5759 **Comment Id:** 364256 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please reconsider your decision I beg you! My dog lives for running and swimming along Fort Funston and Crissy Field. It's hard having an animal in such a small apartment, and the only way she can release her pent up energy is to run freely along the shore.

Unfortunately, my dog does not enjoy enclosed dog parks so I rely on places such as Fort Funston and Crissy.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5763 **Comment Id:** 364261 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The impact to dog owners and their dogs will be to eliminate existing spaces and concentrating them into even smaller areas. Dogs need space to run free and the areas selected in the past met the criteria but also protected critical wildlife areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Kevin Ivanovic **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5797 **Comment Id:** 364322 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our lives have been enriched by the community of friends we have made there - friends from all social, economic and ethnic backgrounds, people we would never have met otherwise. Our dogs have always been active and the too small city dog parks do not afford them or us the opportunity for enough exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5847 **Comment Id:** 364395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura I Ducoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364481 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I used to also frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command, less now, because they are too crowded, my dog feels more tense, there's not enough room to exercise, and they cause more stress to both me and my dog, rather than relaxation.

Organization:

Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5898 **Comment Id:** 364499 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If the only places left for us are over-crowded dog parks, so much of the joy of dog ownership will be taken from both dog and owner, because both dogs and humans need exercise and the joy of variety of experience for health and happiness.
Organization:
Commenter: Elisabeth Weir **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5901 **Comment Id:** 364503 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If the restrictive GGNRA dog management rules are enacted, San Francisco's parks will be flooded with all the people and dogs that currently use GGNRA areas.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5922 **Comment Id:** 364642 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Taking Ft. Funston away from us as dog owners would mean squeezing hundreds more dogs into city parks which has already shown to create stress for the dogs and owners resulting in more fights between dogs AND owners because of confined space and lack of room to run and be free.
Organization:
Commenter: Steve J Baechtle **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5986 **Comment Id:** 364863 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Recreationareas in all counties should have areas for dog Walking on and off leash. The plan as it is set now is unfair to dog owners and is likely to have a negative effect on their parts of commnities such as dog and neighborhood parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Celeste C Neumann **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6005 **Comment Id:** 364883 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I rarely visit dog parks and city parks with my dogs becuase i find that many of the owners who take their dogs there, are just there as a quick way to let their dog off leash. There can often be unbalanced dogs at parks like this. These parks will be overrun with people and dogs if GGNRA restricts access to existing lands.
Organization:

Commenter: sarah jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6027 **Comment Id:** 364989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Considering the city of San Francisco has more dogs than children it worries me that more dog friendly off leash areas get restricted resulting in more dogs being at the designated fenced in dog parks. This does not give any dog the freedom to run and burn energy. Having off leash area's will also not cost more money than creating and maintaining fenced in dog play area's.
Organization:
Commenter: Andreas Wieder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6058 **Comment Id:** 365278 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In my experience, people who do not have good voice control over their dogs to to parks with fences, such as Lafayette Park, near our home. There have been incidents there of people bringing out of control dogs to these areas because they feel there is a safety mechanism in place. This is dangerous for other pets, their owners, and especially children.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah L Stern **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6065 **Comment Id:** 365293 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I currently am part of a task force for Burlingame/Hillsborough looking to revamp the dog parks, but if the dogs are unable to be off lease such as you are planning, the dog parks will be over run with too many dogs and puts all the animals at risk for disease.
Organization:
Commenter: Charlotte M Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6116 **Comment Id:** 365464 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The DEIS ignores impact on residents or area resources, especially city parks if restrictions take effect. Note that the SF Board of Supervisors passed a resolution opposing the Preferred Alternative because of the lack of study of impacts on city parks.
Organization:
Commenter: SUSAN OBAYASHI **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6142 **Comment Id:** 365607 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the

Preferred Alternative. What little attention is paid to this is just an estimate. Why wasn't the issue studied thoroughly as the San Francisco board of supervisors has requested?

Organization:

Commenter: Robert A Dewey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365753 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sweeny Ridge/Cattle Hill I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge trail system. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if a dog is leashed it will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing. Visitor use of Sweeeny Ridge is relativity low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal. Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365754 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A) I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a

rural park setting. Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365755 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E) I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the new Devils Slide Trail. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366088 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: CDW can be accommodated elsewhere in the local area. The SEIS does demonstrate the imperative to permit CDW on national park land. Commercial dog walkers have access to at least 28 off-leash dog play areas throughout the City of San Francisco and make frequent-and unrestrained-use of San Francisco's remaining city parks. (See, e.g., SEIS at 31).

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6246 **Comment Id:** 366197 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Finally, the SEIS fails to adequately address the impact on SF City parks.

Organization:
Commenter: Rhonda Vitanye **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6608 **Comment Id:** 367152 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: WHEREAS, the SEIS does not adequately address the impacts on county parks and open space, or traffic in neighboring communities as a result of implementing Alternative F
Organization: Marin County Board of Supervisors
Commenter: Kathrin Sears **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 368004 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Surprisingly, the SEIS states that, "potential impacts on social and economic conditions [in San Francisco] would be highly unlikely to exceed a negligible threshold, and are therefore eliminated from detailed consideration..." (18) This is wrong, and has already been proven wrong. The effect on city parksand on continued ability to recreate on the limited open space in the urban Bay Area will be both profound and deleterious. This was already graphically demonstrated by the half-day closure of Fort Funston on March 11, 2011, the day of the expected tsunami from Japan. On that Friday morning, Stern Grove in San Francisco was overrun by cars and by hundreds of people and dogs, as dog owners and walkers sought other sites for their daily recreation. (19)
Organization:
Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368103 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. The public and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors requested this analysis in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, albeit much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The GGNRA has not adequately studied the dispersion effect of its plan on local communities, neighborhoods and residential areas. These include parking, traffic congestion, driving patterns and increased miles traveled to reach dog-friendly areas
Organization:
Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368236 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Overall the proposed management plan that will reduce dog access area by over 75% is too restrictive and is not taking into consideration the impacts on local dog parks, roads,

additional air pollution and the limited space you are considering. Many of the proposed areas to continue off leash dog walking are less accessible and do not take into consideration the guardians that have limited mobility that need to exercise and enjoy their dogs. Fenced in off leash areas are too small, generally have surfaces that are either harmful to the paws of running dogs or muddy and do not allow us to hike and exercise with our dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4502 **Comment Id:** 368680 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not reduce off leash areas. It's hard as it is to find open space to throw a ball for your dog. The off leash areas in most parks are small & get too congested with dogs & their people.

Organization:

Commenter: Elaine Benoit **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6540 **Comment Id:** 368708 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The dog management plan fails to adequately acknowledge the GGNRA's location within San Francisco; it lacks integration with other parks and public spaces in the city that are not part of the GGNRA, but are also used by city residents. The too-severe restrictions on off-leash dogs will result in displacement of those dog uses to other city parks. That environmental impact needs to be studied equally with the GGNRA impacts.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara A Goode **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6663 **Comment Id:** 369527 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If that area is lost, those owners wll bring their large dogs to the smaller city parks where there is more danger of overcrowding. Not only dog owners and their dogs will suffer, but small chiIdren or elderly or handicapped people may be crowded out.

Organization:

Commenter: Norma Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6666 **Comment Id:** 369539 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Yet, the Plan allows only extremely confined areas permitting dogs in the GGNRA that will soon become severely overcrowded, which will result in serious congestion in nearby neighborhood dog parks. San Francisco's dog parks are already limited, and off-leash areas are particularly scarce. If guardians and their dogs are displaced from the GGNRA and forced to relocate to the city's dog parks, this overcrowding will become increasingly

problematic and potentially dangerous. These negative impacts will be felt by individuals both with and without pets, as well as the already overburdened City of San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department.

Organization: San Francisco SPCA

Commenter: Brandy Kuentzel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/30/2014)

LU3010 Adjacent Lands: Impacts to other State, County, Regional, or local Parks (Substantive)

1. **Commenters expressed concern that the preferred alternative would adversely impacts city parks, including areas for off-leash dogs, as well as other areas. They felt these areas would become overcrowded, leading to degradation and dangerous situations. Alternately, one commenter noted that the preferred alternative would not have a noticeable impact on city parks.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 141 **Comment Id:** 346304 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Many dog fanatics have argued that the new ggnra dog walking proposed rules would have an impact on the city lands however this was far from true. During the government shutdown with park lands being not or less accessible, there were increases in problems in the SF city parks. There were still a lot of dogs but not there really was no appreciable change. I think the government shut down proved that the new ggnra rules (which would provide more dog areas than during the government shut down) would not adversely affect the city lands.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1884 **Comment Id:** 354438 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to voice my opinion to oppose the GGNRA's revised dog plan. I fear that by placing restrictions on what have traditionally been dog-friendly spaces, smaller spaces such as city parks will now have to accommodate an influx of dogs and may lead to more conflict between dog owners and non-dog owners. As San Francisco is a city with a robust dog population, it seems unwise to greatly reduce the amount of available recreation space, especially as it construes such a small amount of the overall GGNRA land holdings.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Elefterakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4461 **Comment Id:** 355997 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this occurs, the spaces in which dog-owners are left take their animals for exercise and fresh air will be more heavily concentrated, which may have negative consequences such as increasing traffic and waste in those areas, increasing the amount of dog-fights in these highly-concentrated off-leash areas, or conversely, deterring owners from taking their dogs out at all.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Hillary Acer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3837 **Comment Id:** 359957 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Have you ever considered the fact that if you close off these areas it will throw more pressure on our streets and parks. Making those areas, as well as our neighborhoods more crowded will impact people that are afraid of dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: jan w stevenson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5622 **Comment Id:** 364020 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: But, it is of utmost importance to have dog walking parks in the area that are not city parks. Dog walking is healthier for dogs and individuals. Smaller city parks are not meant as dog use parks. These are small facilities meant for family use for picnics, games, parties where dog use is only a nuisance. In more open areas, dog are free to excersize and socialize as are their owners. I am not a dog owner, but I clearly see the need and benefit to continue open use of recreational parks and beaches for dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Linda Dobra **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6666 **Comment Id:** 369539 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Yet, the Plan allows only extremely confined areas permitting dogs in the GGNRA that will soon become severely overcrowded, which will result in serious congestion in nearby neighborhood dog parks. San Francisco's dog parks are already limited, and off-leash areas are particularly scarce. If guardians and their dogs are displaced from the GGNRA and forced to relocate to the city's dog parks, this overcrowding will become increasingly problematic and potentially dangerous. These negative impacts will be felt by individuals both with and without pets, as well as the already overburdened City of San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department.
Organization: San Francisco SPCA
Commenter: Brandy Kuentzel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

2. **The restriction of off-leash dogs within the GGNRA would cause more issues within the remaining ROLA areas and in areas for on-leash dog walking. Commenters expressed concerns about having more people in smaller areas, resulting in overcrowding and creating a dangerous situation as well as increased resource degradation.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 154 **Comment Id:** 349881 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As it is well known, there are many dogs in and near San Francisco. One estimate I have heard is ~175,000 dogs in SF County alone. Further restricting where dog owners and commercial dog walking operations can (legally) take their dogs will promote further conflict in the few remaining off leash areas (your plan calls them ROLAs).

Organization: Seth Green Canine Care

Commenter: Seth Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1189 **Comment Id:** 351950 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Reducing available open space for dog walking on or off leash will strain our Citys Parks and open spaces. The Ocean Beach Trail along Great Highway, which is cited multiple times throughout the SEIS as an available on leash dog walking area within the Ocean Beach Snowy Plover Protection Area, is actually under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. This trail also is already constrained by its multiple uses, including pedestrians, bicyclists, joggers, and dog walkers. It is further constrained due to its width of approximately ten feet. Removing dog walking from this portion of Ocean Beach would put further pressure on this already heavily used pathway.

Organization: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Commenter: Eric and Katy Mar and Tang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1986 **Comment Id:** 354649 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Also there is no area in the city where there is as much real estate for off leash area. So now the much smaller proposed off leash areas will become way more crowded and there will be a greater chance of dog fights and injuries, and a greater chance of catching illnesses for the dogs as they are exposed to more dogs/germs in a smaller, more crowded space.

Organization:

Commenter: loretta j jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4604 **Comment Id:** 361130 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And what about the collateral damage of this change in policy for these areas? Does it matter to anyone that the few open spaces left will be overcrowded and likely damaged by the excess number of visitors who have no other options?

Organization:

Commenter: Kathy N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364803 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Creating a narrow off-leash park for dogs is an invitation for intensive use that

will concentrate erosion and dog smells - thus creating the problem that is cited for elimination elsewhere. The NPS is well aware that spreading use over a larger land area where vegetation can recover if damaged is a lower impact strategy. Similarly, restricting dog walking to concentrated areas will intensify any impacts thereto.

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6121 **Comment Id:** 365479 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If nothing else, give us more of Fort Funston for off-leash use. Reducing the available off-leash areas as much as you propose will mean more dogs in a smaller space, putting greater stress on the existing vegetation and soil, and likely producing an increase in dog feces per square foot. Most of us clean up, but not everyone does or will - with more dogs in less space, it won't be pretty.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate Hellenga **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Commenters were concerned about the mention of specific parks as alternatives to the GGNRA for off-leash dog walking. The most commonly mentioned area was Little Beach; commenters noted that it was not a suitable area for dog use, as it was difficult to access, had no parking or amenities, and crossed private property. Commenters also mentioned Lake Merced, McLaren Park, Stern Grove, Alamo Square, DuBoce Park, Buena Vista Park, Pine Lake, Golden Gate Park, and Bernal Heights.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 322 **Comment Id:** 350584 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Do not direct public to the "Little Beach" adjacent Muir Beach. This beach cannot sustain the traffic, nor is access all year round as tides vary with the season. Coastal trail is currently open to dog walking. In preferred plan no dogs will be allowed. This will virtually cut the community of Muir Beach off from any dog walking other than on the busy Frank Valley Rd, Hwy 1 community roads.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1007 **Comment Id:** 351416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As further proof that the GGNRA did not consider impacts on city parks in San Francisco, the Preferred Alternative suggests the nearest legal off-leash area in San Francisco to Fort Funston is Lake Merced. That off-leash area has been closed to off-leash for years and has been turned into a native plant restoration area and habitat for the endangered red-legged frog among other animals. Yet this is where the SEIS suggests people with dogs go.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 852 **Comment Id:** 353418 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I'm writing to express my STRONG OPPOSITION to the proposed dog management plan for GGNRA. My concern stems from how this plan will negatively affect Bay Area parks that are not part of the GGNRA. By pushing most of the dogs out of the GGNRA, the most likely place for people to take their pets is regional and urban parks, such as McLaren Park in the south eastern portion of San Francisco. McLaren is a dog-friendly place, and already there's concern that heavy dog use is affecting the flora and fauna of the park, especially with the volume of dog walkers with their client's pets. If GGNRA properties are deemed off limits to dogs, parks like McLaren will be overwhelmed and the natural environment of this park could be severely damaged. By spreading dogs throughout all the open space in the bay area, including GGNRA properties, the damage to any one location will be minimized.
Organization: Save McLaren Park
Commenter: Thomas Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2653 **Comment Id:** 354790 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Local Remington and Mill Valley dog parks have poor access, inadequate parking, and are too close to local schools, which will present a danger to Marin's children if these inadequate dog parks are overrun with dogs at their entrances and exits.
Organization: private homeowner, single dog owner
Commenter: Betsy Alberty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2197 **Comment Id:** 356759 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The only alternative in the area would be Stern Grove that would, as a result, suffer from over crowding. Also, Stern Grove is inaccessible on Sundays over the summer due to the Festival, so dog owners would have no alternative.
Organization:
Commenter: Eve E ChaurandFraser **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2338 **Comment Id:** 357827 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I'm afraid what will happen to Pine Lake if GGNRA land goes all on-leash/no dog. It's a terrible loss for urban citizens to walk freely with their pets in these small areas.
Organization:
Commenter: renee f mckenna **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2402 **Comment Id:** 358899 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Just about one in every three households in San Francisco has a dog, and this is going to dramatically impact San Franciscans. It is also going to impact city parks, because if this proposal passes hundreds upon hundreds of people and their dogs are going to flood places like Maclaren Park and Golden Gate Park.

Organization:

Commenter: morton bearman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4039 **Comment Id:** 360309 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog walkers who currently use GGNRA locations to perform their duties will be largely displaced to San Francisco city parks, such as Bernal Heights and McLaren. Increased use of these parks by dozens or hundreds of dog walkers and their groups will lead to excessive erosion and the virtual destruction of those parks. I grew up half a block away from Bernal Heights Park and to see it turn into a pile of rubble due to overuse is a tragic thing to consider.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrew Keller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362666 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS has no impact studies for turning Little Beach in to a de facto ROLA, and it also has no impact studies for an outright ban of dogs on Muir Beach, which would force all people with dogs in to a tiny neighborhood beach that has no parking, no bathrooms, no trash and no maintenance by the County in any way.The street that accesses Little Beach, Sunset Way, is not even County-maintained! Therefore, any alternative that either requires leashes for Muir Beach, or outright bans dogs on Muir Beach will have a dramatic impact on Little Beach and the surrounding community. You can probably count on the fact that the GGNRA will incur a lawsuit over this issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5739 **Comment Id:** 364204 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Little beach must not become the defacto dog park. There are many problems with this idea. Lack of amenities and lack of accessibility will lead to unsafe parking on Sunset Way where there is already not enough parking and too many problems with emergency vehicle access on the long, one lane road. It will lead to a concentration of dogs that will leave no room for other uses for the neighborhood and other uses. There will be almost no enforcement of laws and it will become littered with pet waste and human waste. Little beach should have a leash rule, at least during most of the day (perhaps off leash hours beginning in the later afternoon).

Organization:

Commenter: Erin Pinto **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

4. Commenters were worried that visitors who were no longer able to walk their dogs in the GGNRA would begin to crowd city sidewalks and streets, as well as other city areas, such as ball fields. Other commenters expressed concerns that dog owners would act non-compliantly and continue to use areas where they were not allowed.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1552 **Comment Id:** 353091 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And finally, parks and recreation struggles daily with the high demands on the community fields. As parents of children in multiple sports, we see that this is a real land management issue, and redirecting the families and pets out of the hills, these fields come under greater strain.
Organization:
Commenter: andrea flynn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3690 **Comment Id:** 355606 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: All the dog owner will then go to other areas and overcrowd those parks with their dogs. Having these area for me and my dog keeps me happy, sane and rejuvenated. If a majority of the dogs in SF had to start using the sidewalks as bathroom and be on leashes walking around the block I don't think this will be an appealing city to live in. It also may create new behaviors in dogs that will have a negative effect.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Renee Naleppa **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2744 **Comment Id:** 357162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Running and walking your dog only on streets is not especially fun, it's not as healthy as the variety of terrain provided in a park like Rancho, and frankly, in an area that is as rural as the Moss Beach / Montara / El Granada area, it's pretty hard to get a real workout without simply running laps on the streets. (And running on PCH is hardly enjoyable and barely safe.)
Organization:
Commenter: Peter A Peterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2370 **Comment Id:** 358421 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. The ability to take our dogs on trails in the area and enjoy the natural beauty is

critical to our family's quality of life. Additionally, I imagine the streets of the cities will become a nuisance as they will be filled with people walking dogs, and unfortunately, many will not be diligent about picking up dog poop.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah Huber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5723 **Comment Id:** 364186 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a dog owner Fort Funston in San Francisco is one of the few places we can take our dog to run free. The number of dogs and there owners who use the park is incredible , and considering the number of dogs, the place is very well maintained. Most dogs are under voice command, and dogs get along well. If you remove this location from dog owners to use off lease, I fear the will simply go to other parks and beaches and let there dogs run off lease where they do not belong. There would be more beaches effected by dogs running off leash and the problem would only become worse.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Ruble **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 3 **Comment Id:** 337952 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Eliminating areas where dogs (under voice control) are able to run freely with make those few parks in San Francisco with off leash areas more crowded than they already are.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel M Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 38 **Comment Id:** 338002 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: One of the reasons we live is San Francisco is because it's so dog friendly. One of the reasons we live near Ocean Beach is because dogs were allowed leash free when we moved here. Now we deal with the leash law most of the year, and while not as good for our dog, it's tolerable, because we still have Ft. Funston down the road. But if you ban dogs from there and severely restrict them from being allowed at Ocean Beach and GGNRA properties, you're going to see SF city parks overrun by dogs, many more cases of dog aggression, lots of unhappy dogs, and owners who might head to the hills.

Organization:

Commenter: Maria Hanson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 46 **Comment Id:** 338015 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am strongly supportive of Alternative A. Reducing the amount of off-leash dog parks would cause our city parks to become flooded with dogs and people, creating unsafe environments for all.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristen I Ostro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 66 **Comment Id:** 338952 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: San Francisco has 340K households and between 110K and 160K dogs. So one-third to one-half of the households have a dog. Many more than have a child. And if members of those households take the trouble to visit one of the locations GGNRA administers, they would prefer to bring their dog. Dogs need exercise every day. The locations regulated by GGNRA represent the primary destinations for recreation in the city. People who have a dog and a normally busy life probably only get one chance a day to experience these locations, often coinciding with the time in the day when they would logically walk their dog. So if they are truly deterred by rangers preventing them from walking their dogs, or restricted to tiny areas, or to lease only access on paved paths, then they will simply walk their dogs somewhere else and not come to GGNRA lands. There will be more pressure on local parks much less well suited to the purpose.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael S Gorman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 145 **Comment Id:** 346311 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I understand that there needs to be a healthy human to canine to nature balance within the GGNRA, but with closing these areas off, the other areas of San Francisco and Marin counties that do allow off-leash dogs will become very overcrowded and could possibly be a threat to our dog community.
Organization:
Commenter: elizabeth mccormick **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 174 **Comment Id:** 349981 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I understand that the GGNRA area is separate from the city of San Francisco, Marin County etc. However, when talking about impact on residents you can't isolate the experience to just what happens on GGNRA land. San Francisco only has these areas on GGNRA land. Restricting GGNRA access to dogs on leash only would completely reduce if not highly eliminate where dog owners can exercise their pets. There's not an easy answer but any GGNRA proposal needs to be partnered with city official input.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 203 **Comment Id:** 350102 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: All this will do is crowd out the city off leash areas. This CANNOT be allowed to stand!
Organization:
Commenter: Andrew Narraway **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 211 **Comment Id:** 350119 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Without being able to take our dogs for exercise at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, or other GGNRA dog friendly areas, we'd be in enormously overcrowded city parks. This doesn't suit anyone - - not the dog owners, non-dog owners, dogs, or city at large. It also doesn't suit the GGNRA, who to this point are beloved by the city which we share.
Organization:
Commenter: Buckley White **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 238 **Comment Id:** 350169 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, the GGNRA closures will nearly certainly result in serious overcrowding of dog parks within the City of San Francisco. As dog guardians and dog walkers can attest, the City's dog parks are already quite limited, with off-leash areas being particularly scarce.

Organization:

Commenter: chris benson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 369 **Comment Id:** 351272 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In the NPS's "preferred alternative" for Muir Beach, leashes would be required on Big Beach. The NPS's justification for the workability of such a change is that Little Beach is there for all who want to let their dogs run. Here is the language cut and pasted from the draft EIS: "There is some limited availability for off-leash dog walking, on the beach below the adjacent neighborhood, a small county beach (Little Beach) adjacent to the NPS beach. Visitors could access Little Beach by walking their dogs on leash across Muir Beach." I am especially disturbed by this missive. This is using Little Beach as a de facto ROLA (Regulated Off Leash Area). Little Beach is not part of the park. The property is County and privately owned and, as a practical matter, often inaccessible due to high tides. We have serious concerns about funneling an entire user group over to Little Beach- -without services, trash, restrooms or parking. Local residents are concerned about the impact on Pacific Way, Sunset Way, Cove Lane and the beach trails when nonresidents try to access Little Beach with their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Wynn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 389 **Comment Id:** 351303 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: You will be crowding the local SF neighborhood parks with more dogs since you are restricting so much of Crissy Field and other areas to off leash dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 392 **Comment Id:** 351307 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I don't think it is in the best interest of the residents of San Francisco to take away so much space where dogs can free. This will overcrowd other areas of the city with dogs, and will be much worse for the human residents of the city.

Organization:

Commenter: Mara Klein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 453 **Comment Id:** 351391 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: By taking away land you make areas more crowded and you will have trouble.
Organization:
Commenter: Doreen Malaspina **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 464 **Comment Id:** 351742 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As you well know, your proposed restriction will not only harm many of us who responsibly enjoy Crissy Field with our dogs, it will also negatively impact the smaller dog parks which will be crowded and uncomfortable for dogs who have not been allowed to run.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara Stuart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1164 **Comment Id:** 351805 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail where there are many hikers, alongside people who regularly enjoy the trail with our dogs. I worry that closing access to this trail will cause our local public parks to be overrun with off-leash dogs trying to get exercise alongside small children, picnickers, etc. it will become a madhouse with lots of upset parents and dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Amy M Finn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 504 **Comment Id:** 351825 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In reviewing the SEIS document, I was delighted to see that the off-leash regulations at Rodeo Beach would only be slightly changed by all but the most ruthless plan (Alternative D), to which of course I am fervently opposed. However, even those plans that are most generous to dog owners (Alternative B, C, E, and F) would simply redistribute the demand for off-leash dog areas in the Bay Area. This poses a serious problem. Dog owners who ordinarily use Crissy Field or Muir Beach will flock to Rodeo Beach, for example. Not only will this increase vehicle traffic over the Golden Gate bridge and through the Marin Headlands (which is only supported by two small roads, which are already congested with tourist traffic), but it will also risk turning Rodeo Beach into an over-used dog-park. That would be terrible for both dog-owners and other visitors. By giving dog-owners a greater variety of choices (as the current regulations provide), not only will their dogs be happier, but so will the other people who use the areas for a variety of recreational activities.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1261 **Comment Id:** 352191 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And certainly insufficient study has been done to show the impact to lands from the displacement. These lands could include GGNRA lands were dogs are not being taken (legally or not), other state parks in the area, and of course city parks, which will then be the only remaining legal dog areas that will not be able to cope with increased load.

Organization:

Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1446 **Comment Id:** 352573 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog also goes regularly to Ft Funston Park for off-leash walks. That park is well known as a place for dogs. It is my understanding that this park will largely become off limits for off leash dogs. Where are these dogs going to go for exercise? I think the NPS is being short sighted in closing any of these spaces. It will result in over-crowding in other areas causing problems that never existed before.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda J Belden **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 577 **Comment Id:** 352663 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If you make Muir Beach into a leash dog region, of course the owners of the dog will simply migrate to little beach. This area is a bit of a sanctuary for residents and it seems incredibly unfair to have that protective very small beach encroached upon by turists when the main beach is made specifically for visitor recreation. in addition there is danger to both dog and owner alike migrating from the main beach to little beach... if you add the treat of an unleashed area you will surely encourage migration and very likely, potential injury to visitors and their dogs. Due to the mandates of the coastal zone much for coastal region has given priority to visitors... please consider residents requests to enjoy our beach, walk our dogs off leash without the additional visitors who would significantly change The neighborhood feel of little beach.. What a shame that would be.

Organization:

Commenter: Lesa Kramer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 578 **Comment Id:** 352666 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I disagree with changing the regulations to prohibit off-leash dogs from Muir Beach for the following reasons: 2) Closing Muir Beach to off leash dogs may displace some of those dogs to Rodeo causing increased traffic on the roads leading to Rodeo, itself with adverse environmental effects.

Organization:

Commenter: TIMOTHY M SOWERBY **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1774 **Comment Id:** 352742 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: this proposed dog management plan is the wrong way to go. It will create more problems than it intends to fix ... traffic, overcrowding, and overuse.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 632 **Comment Id:** 352774 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks,

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Block **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 681 **Comment Id:** 352927 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I urge you to keep the 1979 Pet Policy in place for the GGNRA. If off leash dog walking is banned it will create a tremendous burdon for city, county and state parks. During the federal government shutown in fall 2013 several if not all areas in the GGNRA were closed. During this time I noticed a huge spike in usage for off leash dog walking in San Francisco city parks. If off leash dog walking access is restricted in the GGNRA it will lead to unsustainable usage levels in city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 713 **Comment Id:** 353013 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Your dog management plan will cause many dog owners to over crowd the few other park areas open to dogs. In my small one block area of El Granada, 11 of 12 households have dogs. You have to consider how the restrictions will impact other public use sites.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan E Messner Whipp **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1777 **Comment Id:** 353196 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: And finally, we would have to seek out altunative off leash areas further away from San Francisco so our family could get some exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Dean Rizzi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 783 **Comment Id:** 353285 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If the GGNRA further limits dog walking as recreation, what few surrounding parks and trails that do allow off-leash will become overcrowded and overburdened.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 836 **Comment Id:** 353396 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan to limit off-leash access for the city's dogs means that our city parks will become over run with dogs. The new plan affects not only dog owners: anyone who uses city parks will immediately notice the difference. The city parks alone are not large enough for all the dogs that already live here in the city! This new plan is bad for dog owners AND for people who do not have dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Ren Volpe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 843 **Comment Id:** 353404 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If they are not able to use the areas they have been using in the ggnra for the last 20 years it will overwhelm the city parks with dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 857 **Comment Id:** 353443 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As it stands, Crissey Field and Fort Funston among others are needed by the dog walkers. Taking that away will overcrowd the city parks with animals. THe City parks are now shared by animals that are familiar with eachother and live in harmony with parents and their children.

Organization:

Commenter: maureen jennings **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 858 **Comment Id:** 353444 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am very concerned with the conservation of our City parks, and the impact that extremely restrictive regulation of dogs in our treasured GGNRA/SF will have on our neighborhood parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Leila Dwight **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 862 **Comment Id:** 353451 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As you know, nearly one-third of households in San Francisco include at least one dog, and they all need to be walked daily. Limiting the areas that already allow dogs will flood our city parks with dogs (both on and off-leash), which seems unnecessary and counter-productive.
Organization:
Commenter: Thomas R Muer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 873 **Comment Id:** 353483 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I live near McLaren Park, which also has a large and well-used off-leash area for dogs, perhaps the only other one in the city that is equivalent to Fort Funston or Chrissy Field. I am concerned that if this new plan goes into effect, then McLaren will become even more heavily over-used, creating a serious threat to this beautiful city park.
Organization:
Commenter: Charles J Whelon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1942 **Comment Id:** 353541 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: I expect that if your proposed changes are implemented at Fort Funston, we will see Stern Grove flooded with dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Ruben Garcia **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4113 **Comment Id:** 353607 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: The proposed restrictions will also have a negative impact on quality of life throughout the city as the increasingly limited dog friendly areas become overcrowded and inaccessible.
Organization:
Commenter: kristin hinkle **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1715 **Comment Id:** 353682 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you do this all dogs will be in one spot and I can tell you it will get to be dangerous.
Organization: none
Commenter: Heather Selick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1730 **Comment Id:** 353706 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA is a large part of Marin County with very limited access for dog owners already, further restrictions will force dog owners to even more limited open space preserves and thereby increasing the number of incidents in those areas. This high density of dogs in small designated areas can already be felt, causing increase incident rates and environmental impact.
Organization:
Commenter: Inka S Traktman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 930 **Comment Id:** 353782 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If 90% o the areas are closed under the new laws, the remaining areas will become very crowded and overburdened and likely no longer a good place to take my dog. I may be forced to move out of San Francisco.
Organization:
Commenter: Cindy B Potter **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 933 **Comment Id:** 353788 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Having an off leash area just at Little Beach portion would be a disaster because a) it requires scaling rocks at high tide b) there is no beach area at low tide, c) there are no garbage facilities to handle waste.
Organization:
Commenter: Daniel R Fitzpatrick **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 934 **Comment Id:** 353791 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Having an off leash area on just Little Beach portion would be a disaster because a) it requires scaling rocks at high tide b) there is no beach area at low tide, c) there are no garbage facilities to handle waste.
Organization:
Commenter: Darcy Fitzpatrick **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 950 **Comment Id:** 353814 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The city parks will be overwhelmed and destroyed if the footprint if the GGNRA becomes smaller and smaller.
Organization:

Commenter: Cammy W Tyler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4343 **Comment Id:** 353832 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: Eliminating access to places like Ft. Funston, Crissy Field and Baker Beach would cause severe over-crowding in other places like local parks and small enclosed dog parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Julia Mason **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1803 **Comment Id:** 354106 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Leaving only Rodeo Beach for dogs to be off-leash is unfair and could also create other problems such as over-crowding.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1834 **Comment Id:** 354302 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am near certain of the impact though; less active dogs, with pent up energy in a city with so many dogs = a lot more acting out, overcrowding of the few dog areas in the city and therefor more dog issues between dogs and with people. Restricting off leash areas just because will not be without ramifications; why do it????
Organization:
Commenter: Alan B Brisbon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5182 **Comment Id:** 354487 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: if these new rules are implemented, hundreds more dogs will flood into already crowded city parks, and the results will not be good for SF or any other area.
Organization:
Commenter: val ornoy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5201 **Comment Id:** 354490 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: If these new rules are implemented, hundreds more dogs will flood into already crowded city parks, and the results will not be good for SF or any other area.
Organization:
Commenter: Alexis Stricker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1896 **Comment Id:** 354497 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Consider the impact it will have on the few areas that you are allowing dogs. How will those areas be effected when all of the dogs in the city have to migrate there.
Organization:
Commenter: Amanda Whichard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1925 **Comment Id:** 354562 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would hate to think of all of the dogs in SF squeezing into fewer places (just Rodeo for an off-leash option) instead of being able to spread out into the parks and beaches we currently enjoy for off-leash options. Up and down the coast, there are so many beaches and parks that only allow leashed dogs (or don't allow them at all) that I can't imagine further restrictions helping anyone.
Organization:
Commenter: Kate M Denevan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1929 **Comment Id:** 354567 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Should dog owners be encoraged to be more responsible vis-a-vis their pets, certainly. But, greatly restricting their access and/or concentrating their use to an ever shrinking area will only concentrate the problems.
Organization:
Commenter: Guy V Palmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1976 **Comment Id:** 354638 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If this ban goes forward, where are the dogs supposed to go? The parks are already crowded as it is, imagine how much more crowded they'll become when they have less places to go.
Organization:
Commenter: Sasha Moyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2007 **Comment Id:** 354677 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am most concerned about the proposed reduction in off-leash freedom, and even complete banning of dogs, from so many areas of the GGNRA. I urge you to consider the repercussions such changes would have. People will continue to have dogs, but without access to so many of these open spaces they will drive more (increase traffic and pollution); or cause new sets of problems to occur by overcrowding of small neighborhood parks.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2036 **Comment Id:** 354707 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Limiting access to the dogs at these beautiful parks will mean that everyone will pile up in city run parks. Please remain dog friendly for the enjoyment of everyone - humans and canines alike
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2654 **Comment Id:** 354793 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It makes no sense to further restrict areas that allow off/on leash assess for dogs. There is already limited access to parks that allow dogs off/on leash to further restrict would result in overcrowding and more issues in the existing areas that are available. I support responsible dog ownership - - but why limit areas that have been accessible for off/on leash dog walking since 1979. PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE GGNRA's DOG PLAN.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeff M Polley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2822 **Comment Id:** 354875 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog parks in SF are rare, too small and too far away, and the plan fails to account for how un-exercised dogs on crowded sidewalks and streets will pose far more harm to people than trained dogs playing in safe rural off-leash areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Katy Walden **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2888 **Comment Id:** 354957 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because in a densely populated area such as the Bay Area, it is not only filled with people but also their animals. If this bill passes it will cause what few parks and trails that allow access for pets to be com e over crowded and unenjoyable.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: amanda kanoknata **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3128 **Comment Id:** 355388 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this plan is accepted and enforced I will no longer use the the GGNRA for personal enjoyment - Restricting these areas would cause me to find new areas of off leash dog play, all of which will not be able to handle the overflow resulting from these restrictions.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Helen Cleary **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2059 **Comment Id:** 355609 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am not a dog owner and I am concerned on how this dog management plan will affect the city parks. Restricting off leash dog walking access in areas where off leash dogs are now (for example: Chrissy, Fort Funston) can lead to an increase of dogs in our local area parks. How does the GGNRA plan to address/take responsibility this issue, even if the parks are not part of the GGNRA? Local parks may not be part of your jurisdiction, but if this management plan is approved and there is a significant increase of dogs in parks, there is a strong correlation between the two. GGNRA should be held responsible and should be prepared with a solution.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2071 **Comment Id:** 355638 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA's restriction for ALL the dogs and the owners/parents in the San Francisco Bay Area is not going to benefit the City nor its parks and recreational areas for the better.

Organization:

Commenter: Janell A Hughes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2104 **Comment Id:** 355702 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: , the influx of dogs to inadequately-sized city parks would present a crowding problem.

Organization: UCSF

Commenter: Christopher Stauffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2114 **Comment Id:** 355747 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If the dog management plan is adopted, Marins estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

Organization:

Commenter: Lindsay McCrea **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4458 **Comment Id:** 355993 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive. Our City parks are already full and restricting access to GGNRA parks/beaches creates overcrowding
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Melanie Rafaty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2167 **Comment Id:** 356087 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Dominika Knossalla **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2635 **Comment Id:** 356940 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Funneling all dogs onto just five trails is irresponsible and reckless.
Organization:
Commenter: Betsy DeFries **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357066 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. The public and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors requested this analysis in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, albeit much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The GGNRA has not adequately studied the dispersion effect of its plan on local communities, neighborhoods and residential areas. These include parking, traffic congestion, driving patterns and increased miles traveled to reach dog-friendly areas
Organization:
Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357070 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The only off leash area in Marin would be a remote stretch of Rodeo Beach. The closure of these areas will place a huge burden on other open space lands in Marin, causing overcrowding in what few dog parks remain.

Organization:
Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally, there is no study of the real environmental impact of these restrictions on the rest of San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo Counties. The NPS has not considered how these restrictions will affect local communities and City parks. Given the already miniscule percentage (less than 1%) GGNRA currently available to visitors with dogs, the NPS plan is grossly unjust. It would severely impact the lives of its current users and adversely impact the lives of tens of thousands of Bay Area residents.
Organization: Dog City Tours
Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2296 **Comment Id:** 357665 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I'm worried that if the bigger GGNRA parks will close down for off leash dog walking in line with your proposed dog management plan, then the thousands of dogs who get their daily exercise will have to come to the smaller city parks - which are already full of other dogs! I'm talking about parks such as Alamo Square Park, Duboce Park, McLaren Park, Buena Vista Park to mention a few. I don't need to tell you the dangers of over crowding dog parks, but apart from less enjoyable exercise for canines and humans alike, one worrying long term result could be that if San Francisco's pooches will get less exercise overall then that could result in more stressed, misbehaving dogs who might end up in the city shelters if their owners feel they can't cope.
Organization:
Commenter: Linda Liebrand **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2299 **Comment Id:** 357669 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly oppose the Dog Management Plan. It is extremely restrictive, without any evidence of the dogs affecting the environment and wildlife at Fort Funston. The restrictions will cause dogs and their owners to over populate the remaining areas available for off leash dog walking.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Colter **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2860 **Comment Id:** 357679 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If this plan is accepted and enforced I will no longer use the the GGNRA for personal enjoyment - Restricting these areas would cause me to find new areas of off leash dog

play, all of which will not be able to handle the overflow resulting from these restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Helen N Cleary **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2873 **Comment Id:** 357705 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Any reduction to on or off-leash dog areas will only result in the remaining areas getting more crowded. In turn, this will only worsen any conflicts or incidents. For the record, although GGNRA/NPS claims to want to reduce such conflicts, it appears they in fact want to increase the likelihood of such incidents so they can then use these incidents as grounds for yet further reductions until they achieve their backhanded goal of minimizing dog access.
Organization: SaveOffLeash.com
Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2314 **Comment Id:** 357732 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am very concerned that if the GGNRA further limits dog walking as recreation, what few surrounding parks and trails that do allow off-leash will become overcrowded and overburdened. We need more access, not less.
Organization:
Commenter: wendy E Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3036 **Comment Id:** 357749 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: To claim there are off-leash opportunities at Little Beach is a ridiculous and arbitrary solution. This is not a viable option given the VERY small size of Little beach and it is neither state or federal property. We are curious why this is still in print in the SEIS.
Organization:
Commenter: Corinne L Valentine **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2322 **Comment Id:** 357753 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.
Organization:
Commenter: Joseph W Lisella **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2323 **Comment Id:** 357763 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: City parks will be overrun by dogs unable to access these trails...there are simply not nearly enough dog parks to offset these losses of trails in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Alison Sumner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3065 **Comment Id:** 357866 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As most of in San Francisco have a very limited amount of outdoor space, it is essential that we have space to exercise our pets in safe, designated areas. There are many areas where citizens can go to utilize the park areas, and reducing the space available for pet use would push pets into the urban areas, causing unnecessary traffic for citizens. Please keep the space as it is currently allocated!

Organization:

Commenter: Jesse T Martinez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3090 **Comment Id:** 357895 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you take these areas away from dog owners, so many problems will turn up...the parks will be over-crowded...there will, as a result, be more incidents involving dogs and people...dogs and dogs, etc. I don't own a dog, but I do not want to have to deal with these new issues of over-crowding.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3099 **Comment Id:** 357901 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To restrict dog walking i.e off leash, in such a broad stroke, will only cause more crowding and have a negative effect on the livelihood of commercial dog walkers. Personally, I feel the amount of dogs a dog walker is allowed at one time, should be reduced to no more than 4. I typically do no more than three.

Organization:

Commenter: ellen Garvie **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3213 **Comment Id:** 357985 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGNRA wants to ban dogs from being off leash on selected federal lands. The city of San Francisco opposes the ban because of the fear that the ban will result in overuse of the city parks as dog owners look for alternate places to recreate with their pets. City or federal land, it has really come to a head in that dogs are negatively impacting the environment enough to affect people's experience of these spaces.

Organization:

Commenter: Allison Madden **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3317 **Comment Id:** 358133 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Again, I am asking please do not reduce off leash access for dogs. I believe it would severely have a much greater impact (overcrowding the off leash areas) and make the community even more devisive between dog groups and the NPS.
Organization:
Commenter: Suwanna Kerdkaew **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3378 **Comment Id:** 358290 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: According to your own statistics, dog incidents account for such a small percentage of the problems. To funnel dogs to smaller and smaller areas is a sure way to cause problems.
Organization:
Commenter: pam herz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3399 **Comment Id:** 358326 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I also believe that limiting all the areas dogs into designated areas for off leash walks is not practical. There are far too many dogs to be able to be in such a small area.
Organization:
Commenter: Jonathan N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2356 **Comment Id:** 358378 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SF parks will be overwhelmed with dogs if GGNRA proceeds with these ill-conceived, short-sighted measures.
Organization: Aspect Foundation
Commenter: Vivian Fearen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2365 **Comment Id:** 358397 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I write with great concern about the plan to close most of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to dogs. While I recognize the importance of protecting wildlife areas, San Francisco is a city with, already, too little green space for families and their dogs. The GGNRA takes some of the pressure off of the tiny, overused, crowded squares of green that serve as dog runs in this city. In the few and small dog runs we have besides the GGNRA, dogs are so crowded together as to increase their aggression and limit the amount of exercise they can

get. The grass is unusable by children, leading to turf wars between parents and dog-owners (I am both). It's a relief to take our dog to Crissy Field, Fort Funston, and other areas where she can just run. Please consider not reducing the dog space so drastically. The city needs it.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth S Freeman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2378 **Comment Id:** 358455 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Aparna L Reddy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2389 **Comment Id:** 358883 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Furthermore the impact on other city parks and properties if the change were to be adopted has been totally ignored. The current usage of these lands by dog walkers is only 1% o the GGNRA land and the new restrictions would reduce this to 0.1%. re will the many dog owners in San Francisco and other affected surrounding municipalities go? This will most assuredly impact in a detrimental way the remaining smaller areas that can be utilized.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert I Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2433 **Comment Id:** 358931 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Pushing dogs out of GGNRA lands completely is not a solution for the community as a whole as it will overburden county and city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Ellen M Nadeau **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2465 **Comment Id:** 358972 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As the owner of two dogs living in San Francisco, these areas are critical areas I need to keep my dogs exercised. A move as radical as this severely restricts how much free-running exercise my beloved dogs can get. this is bad for me, bad for my dogs, and terrible for city parks, which will become overrun with these areas now off limits.

Organization:

Commenter: Ron M Mee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2544 **Comment Id:** 359070 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: With the ever increasing number of dogs in the county (ie. residents love their dogs and seek services and trails for them), the more you limit access the more problems and congestion there will be on the miniscule number of remaining trails.
Organization:
Commenter: Sheri C Ketchum **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2573 **Comment Id:** 359104 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There are over 100,000 dogs in San Francisco and they need exercise. If off leash walking was restricted in Fort Funston and other GGNRA locations it would cause thousands of people to take their dogs to city parks instead. City parks don't have the capacity for this.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2578 **Comment Id:** 359111 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.
Organization:
Commenter: Allison J Bloodworth **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2579 **Comment Id:** 359114 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael E Miner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2596 **Comment Id:** 359136 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Just about one in every three households in San Francisco has a dog, and this is going to dramatically impact San Franciscans. It is also going to impact city parks, because if this proposal passes hundreds upon hundreds of people and their dogs are going to flood places like Maclaren Park and Golden Gate Park.

Organization:
Commenter: Michael P Feranchak **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3438 **Comment Id:** 359235 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly oppose the plan! As a frequent Crissy Field and East Beach user with my beloved furry companion, restricting our use would negatively impact the quality of our life. There are insufficient off-leash areas for dogs in San Francisco. Packs of professional dog walkers already make fenced in areas too crowded.
Organization:
Commenter: Liz N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3831 **Comment Id:** 359937 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Moreover, this plan will result in a drastic overcrowding of the remaining off-leash areas, significantly harming them in a way that it is sure to overpower any benefits to the restricted areas.
Organization:
Commenter: T.J. N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3840 **Comment Id:** 359963 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This new regulation is going to substantially change the nature of Marin County and the area that so many animal owners cherish and have for so many years. It is too sweeping a change; unfair to so many people who count on those trails and beaches for their own health and exercise and that of their pets. This new regulation would put many people on the road to the few places left, leaving them overcrowded. It would prevent countless older people from going out for a walk with their pets.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia L Ryan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4027 **Comment Id:** 359967 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Restricting off-leash access to only a few beaches (is Rodeo Beach the only one?) will cause Rodeo Beach to be overwhelmed with dog owners seeking off-leash beach access for their dogs. It will inevitably result in significant increases not only in the numbers of dogs there, but also conflicts among dogs, dog waste, and other undesirable effects of so many dogs in a small area. In effect, it would turn Rodeo Beach into a "dog concentration camp". Contrary to one of the stated purposes of the Plan, it is likely to INCREASE USER CONFLICTS at Rodeo Beach. This can benefit no one.
Organization:

Commenter: Alan B Mullendore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3852 **Comment Id:** 359981 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Crissy Field's middle beach will be especially crowded if enforcement moves dog walkers from East Beach to the permitted off-leash middle beach area. Redistribution to city parks might also occur, and education of dog owners will be even more important in the more crowded off-leash dog areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth Ericson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3869 **Comment Id:** 359999 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.
Organization:
Commenter: David Levin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3871 **Comment Id:** 360002 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting so much of the park area to off-leash play concentrates a large population of dogs ina smaller area. The Bay Area has millions of happy, healthy dogs who. like humans and wildlife, nee some open space to exercise and get rid of stress. Some dogs interact joyfully, but by concentrating hundreds of dogs into a smaller area, their off-leash playtime becomes more of a "hang with the pack" event, something not all dogs are comfortable with, nor their owners.
Organization: PIDO
Commenter: Alice M La Pierre **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3919 **Comment Id:** 360011 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.
Organization:
Commenter: Amanda Burke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3920 **Comment Id:** 360013 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would like to voice my opinion in favor of allowing more areas of the GGNRA for use by people with dogs. This would include expanding areas where dogs are allowed both on and off leash. The present state is far too restrictive and results in a large concentration of dogs in a limited area.
Organization:
Commenter: Dixon D Power **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3958 **Comment Id:** 360183 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the GGNRA's Dog Management for a number of reason: 1. I believe that it is too restrictive and that having limited off leash areas will create more problems in the designated areas and surrounding areas too- no research has been done to find out the impacts this will have on other areas
Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth Tausend **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3966 **Comment Id:** 360225 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: That would simply put too much pressure on the few remaining lands where we can go with our dogs, including nearby county and state-held lands.
Organization:
Commenter: anne c harper **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4035 **Comment Id:** 360268 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: it does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. it claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.
Organization:
Commenter: Kristen Aramthanapon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4529 **Comment Id:** 360481 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you continue to push dog owners in to smaller and smaller off-leash locations several things will likely happen. First, as your force the concentration of dogs to higher and

higher numbers in these areas, the negative repercussions will increase. To limit damage by dogs and high foot traffic, INCREASING the space available thereby decreasing the concentration of foot traffic will minimize damage. You are doing the exact wrong thing to protect people and the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4531 **Comment Id:** 360485 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRAs original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan fails to do.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Cone **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4557 **Comment Id:** 360608 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It seems reasonable to me that people need a large area of beach to spread out and if you reduce that area, you are asking for trouble.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicholas Choulos **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4563 **Comment Id:** 360616 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash areas will become more crowded and there will be more incidents of dogs clashing in such a small area

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4562 **Comment Id:** 360651 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you will not let us do it there, we will have to do it in the city parks, which will be overrun. With dog walkers locked out(that is what you plan does, the areas we have been left will be intolerable due to overcrowding, and so we will have to go elsewhere), very few people will be out there using the land except on the days when it is hospitable, warm and beautiful. You will have the hang gliders, a few surfers, an occasional fisherman.

Organization:

Commenter: steve r hooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4590 **Comment Id:** 361085 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When Crissy Field was created, one of the stated purposes was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

Organization:

Commenter: jennifer l hooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4594 **Comment Id:** 361101 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361120 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS also sites that the only off-leash area for all of Marins 60,000 dogs would be a small stretch of Rodeo Beach. That beach is only accessible via car. Right now, many people can walk to their favorite off-leash trail including Oakwood, Miwok, Homestead and others. These federal lands are intertwined with our neighborhoods. Forcing people into their cars to exercise themselves and their dogs is not only horrible for the environment but also hard on the pocketbook. I also think its quite fiendish since the GGNRA has been in the process of downsizing the parking lot at Rodeo Beach and will begin encouraging people to take shuttles therefore making it increasingly impossible for Rodeo to become a full fledge ROLA in the future

Organization:

Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4624 **Comment Id:** 361145 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Zack Kamen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4644 **Comment Id:** 361174 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.
Organization:
Commenter: John Delaplane **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4092 **Comment Id:** 361274 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If we have to get in a car and drive for miles to find an off leash area that every other dog from San Francisco (and there are a lot), not only will that have a negative impact on the environment (all that not previously unnecessary driving) but also dogs in overcrowded areas will get into each other's way and potentially become aggressive.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Ferragano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4101 **Comment Id:** 361282 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am a proud San Francisco resident and taxpayer. I enjoy using the recreation areas in my neighborhood including Chrissy Field, Fort Funston, Lands End, Ocean Beach and Baker Beach with my dog. The GGNRA's proposed alternative is extremely restrictive for off and on leash dog walking. Up to 75% o dog walking access in San Francisco will be eliminated if the GGNRA's proposed alternative is adopted. This would cause the small areas in SF city parks where on and off leash access is allowed to be severely overcrowded. Please do not adopt the GGNRA's proposed alternative.
Organization:
Commenter: Cory N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4739 **Comment Id:** 361416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: With a growing dog population, severely restricting owners' options in the GGNRA will only push dogs into other parts of the city which are less safe and less equipped to handle increased dog activity.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen Gough **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4115 **Comment Id:** 361457 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Further, the plan lacks acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. Surely the GGNRA plan will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas. I don't frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing. My time with my dog outside is a time for both of us to exercise, relax and feel free.

Organization:

Commenter: Monika Fedalen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4788 **Comment Id:** 361533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. The need for open space areas for dogs is important not only for the health of the dog, but to maintain adequate space between dogs. Limiting this open space will therefore result in overcrowding of dogs in the dog parks - leading to unfortunate situations of more aggression and a less relaxed atmosphere.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Kattula **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361561 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sweeney Ridge I prefer option 19A with the addition of all of the Baquiano trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica to its conclusion at the Portola Discovery site. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dog walking given the historical use of area (once an active military site, 4x4 vehicle trails, gas/water/electricity rights of ways, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation. "No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing. "Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. "Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361562 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston: I prefer option 16A over any other. I do not prefer options 16B,C, D, E, or F for the following reasons: "Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Funston trail systems. "Over stating of damage caused by dog usage given the historical use of area (once an active military site, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation. "No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing. "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural, open park setting. "Fort Funston is nationally-recognized as on of the greatest dog parks in the country. This kind of open space is not available anywhere else in the greater bay area. "Is enforcement realistic? It would seem by virtue of the vast, interconnecting trail system, the GGNRA would have to resort to excessive enforcement measures to regulate the trail use. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking. "Fort Funston has no real appeal to any other user group due to its cliffs, steep terrain, and climate. It is my opinion that restricting dog use will not invite the perceived low-impact user(hikers), rather it will invite an element of transients, loiters, and trespassers. The dog users are both the stewards and proprietors of this land; the presence of such unwanted elements is diverted by virtue of the presence of dog enthusiasts among others.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361563 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I Prefer 17A I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (4x4 vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a rural park setting. "Area is in a densely populated area with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking. "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking. "Symbolic fencing and signs have been effective in keeping people as well as people with dogs out of sensitive areas

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361564 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I prefer 20E I do not support with the preferred

alternative of 20F "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle club/ motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.) "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a park setting. "Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361565 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Rancho Corral Tierra I prefer 21A "I do not support the the preferred alternative of 21F due to "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on or off leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.) "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a park setting. "Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash or off dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by dog walking. "Has been unregulated for 30 years "More research needed due to only being a park for less than two years

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4815 **Comment Id:** 361580 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all San Francisco park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

Organization: San Francisco citizen and dog owner

Commenter: Felicia J Zeiger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4840 **Comment Id:** 361619 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4872 **Comment Id:** 361665 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: For sites in San Francisco County, Table 4 indicates that there is only a minor difference in the benefits of Alternative F over Alternative E. Completely closing off portions of Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field from dog access may minorly benefit vegetation and soils, wildlife, special status species, and cultural resources at these locations (although numerical estimates have not been provided), but will have a negative impact to these same items in other parks of the Bay Area where dog owners/walkers will be forced to frequent. As such, there is inherently no difference between Alternative E and alternative F in relation to environmental consequences.
Organization:
Commenter: Lynne Srinivasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361981 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On Page 114, the document calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as their have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the off-limits creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.
Organization:
Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No
Correspondence Id: 4122 **Comment Id:** 362051 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.
Organization:
Commenter: Duane Ernst **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5021 **Comment Id:** 362130 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as their have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the off-limits creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom

facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Rowe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5021 **Comment Id:** 362131 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves - it passes the buck to towns, cities and the county.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Rowe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5103 **Comment Id:** 362185 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am also deeply concerned about overcrowding. The plan also lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas - how will dispersion affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and other dog recreation areas? I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

Organization:

Commenter: Amy Puffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5112 **Comment Id:** 362197 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When I visit GGNRA, I enjoy seeing the responsible dogs and owners that frequent these areas and take the time to get their dogs out for exercise and socialization. I have had positive experiences with the pets and owners. These restrictive proposals would push too many dogs into neighborhood parks or limited on leash areas within the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5163 **Comment Id:** 362298 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4260 **Comment Id:** 362327 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative still have not bee adequately analyzed despite the fact that the analysis was requested by public comment on the original plan and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The revised plan merely says that the GGNRA believes people will continue to walk their dogs in the GGNRA even though the space for doing so has been reduced. No evidence is given to support this statement.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne A Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4263 **Comment Id:** 362335 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. It is very clear to those who use these open areas that the proposed restrictions will dramatically change the character and enjoyment of these areas. The usage of these areas will decrease. It is unclear why the GGNRA wants to reduce the use of these areas, as their charge should be to increase the recreational value of these areas for the public.

Organization:

Commenter: Kim Dang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362663 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: on page 113 of the SEIS, park visitors seeking off-leash opportunities are actually instructed to just head to Little Beach, which in the GGNRA's alternative "F" becomes a de facto ROLA! The SEIS doesnt tell visitors that they will be crawling across private property to get to Little Beach unless the tide is low. Simply outrageous and unacceptable!! I've brought this up to park staff repeatedly, since 2011. No fewer than 3 times. And I was and continue to be told that it will be removed.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5224 **Comment Id:** 362693 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Packing off-leash recreation into small spaces will create unpleasant, crowded "dog runs." Many people, me included, will simply stop going to legal off-leash areas. Will people simply stop walking their dog off-leash? Some may, but many others will probably crowd into city parks. And some will simply walk in areas of the GGNRA where they are not likely to encounter a ranger/citation.

Organization:

Commenter: K Hu **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5247 **Comment Id:** 362784 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my small, neighborhood parks (I.E. Insert park names here) will be over-run with people and their dogs. Dog owners out of desperation will fill up already crowded dog parks if places like Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Rancho Corral de Tierra are cut off. I do not doubt that dog owners will not only fill the neighborhood parks, but also the baseball fields and school yards because of the lack of exercise space for their dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362890 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In Marin County, it will be disaster if there will only be one beach where all Marin's residents and visitors can recreate with their dogs off leash. The beach has extreme tides, forceful waves, and will be packed with thousands of dogs if this plan is enacted - because it's the only off leash beach that will be preserved for all Marin County in the preferred alternative. Additionally, the SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on or off-leash).
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362891 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA's preferred alternative intentionally proposal sets up the proposed dog policy to fail - by restricting a large dog and urban resident population to use such small areas that over-crowding is inevitable. The overcrowding will result in friction between residents with and without dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5294 **Comment Id:** 362911 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.
Organization:

Commenter: Anna Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5469 **Comment Id:** 363326 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption
Organization:
Commenter: Julie Samuels **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4310 **Comment Id:** 363767 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Taking away the off leash ares proposed by the GGNRA will be devastating not only to local area residents, but also to any parks around them.
Organization:
Commenter: Suzie Yannes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5604 **Comment Id:** 363991 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: â€¨It would appear the GGNRA's preferred alternative intentionally sets up the proposed dog policy to fail - by restricting a large dog and urban resident population to use such small areas that over crowding is inevitable. The overcrowding will result in friction between residents with and without dogs. And this will lead to even more restrictions - which is precisely what the GGNRA has apparently preferred all along.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5379 **Comment Id:** 363994 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In Marin County there will be one beach where all of Marin's dogs can recreate off leash. This beach has extreme tides, forceful waves, and will be packed with thousands of dogs - because it's the only off leash beach that will be preserved for all of Marin County in the preferred alternative.
Organization:
Commenter: Lynn Keller **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4375 **Comment Id:** 364132 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5698 **Comment Id:** 364163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Organization:

Commenter: Carly M Braak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5740 **Comment Id:** 364209 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Secondly, the congestion that will be caused by dog walking in the proposed areas allocated for off leash dogs will be astonishing. With the heavy concentration of people, comes with it, pollution, traffic, noise ect. 50% o SF residents have dogs, and those people will be heading to these few designated locations on weekdays and weekends. I feel like the proposed Dog Management Plan has not even scratched the surface of what a problem that this could cause.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex M Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5741 **Comment Id:** 364221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA dog management plan includes a proposal to reduce the off leash recreation area at Crissy Field. This is contrary to the stated intention, policy and principles that were originally used to garner public support for the Chrissy Field plan. This proposed reduction of off leash area is acting in bad faith and without sound basis as the impact on all park visitors will be resulting increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Hugh McDermott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364480 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a change

of course without much basis. Furthermore the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes little sense and I would urge you to reconsider.

Organization:

Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5893 **Comment Id:** 364488 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Schnobrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5912 **Comment Id:** 364609 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not take away the biggest off-leash dog walking area near to my home. The few remaining off=leash parks are going to be severely impacted by the large dogs that need space to run on a daily basis. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area covers a lot of territory across several counties. It seems unfair and arbitrary to prevent dog owners from walking their dogs without a leash on so much public land.

Organization:

Commenter: C Malfatti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5940 **Comment Id:** 364684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We must keep Muir Beach open to dogs off leash. Furthermore, to suggest that people be able to take their dogs to an area of Muir Beach called Little Beach with absolutely no parking, no trash cans or restrooms, would leave a giant mess for the residents.

Organization:

Commenter: Denise M Lamott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4417 **Comment Id:** 365162 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: You have absolutely no regard for the impact your plan would have on city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Lile Adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4421 **Comment Id:** 365170 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please don't make us leash our pets there. Not only will it diminish the enjoyment I get by going there, but it will cause extreme crowding in other off-leash parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Jacque Bohlen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6049 **Comment Id:** 365249 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The current plan is far too restrictive, especially for Marin and San Mateo counties. Dog people with cars will have to drive farther for off-leash exercise, making regional traffic worse and greatly impacting the remaining off-leash areas. Please do not vote for the plan as it is currently configured.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia S Adler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365365 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There is no verified study within your documents showing what the environmental consequences will be from forcing tens of thousands of current users into less than 1/4 of the area currently accessible to dog walking. With NO beaches available in San Mateo County properties, and only one off-leash beach remaining in Marin County, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Fort Funston would see even higher dog walking use within a much smaller footprint.
Organization:
Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365366 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The issue of how having less access will affect local municipal parks has been swept away as negligible within the report, however no additional study was done as was requested by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. The only parks mentioned as taking up the overflow from the GGNRA are designated dog parks, but the affects will be on closer proximity parks such as the Marina Green, the Palace of Fine Arts, Moscone Park, and Mountain Lake Park. The impact on these properties will be significant with less access to traditional dog walking areas in the GGNRA, yet has not been addressed.
Organization:
Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6092 **Comment Id:** 365404 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I very strongly oppose the plan put forth by the GGNRA to ban dogs from Muir Beach as well as from the hiking trails. Not only will this harm local businesses that I currently frequent when I take my dog to these locations, but it will also concentrate more dog owners to fewer places, increasing congestion and causing over-use.

Organization:

Commenter: Harald Loeffler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6327 **Comment Id:** 365615 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I'm commenting on behalf of the non-dog owning parents with children. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my small, neighborhood parks will be over-run with people and their dogs. Dog owners out of desperation will fill up already crowded dog parks if places like Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Rancho Corral de Tierra are cut off. I do not doubt that dog owners will not only fill the neighborhood parks, but also the baseball fields and school yards because of the lack of exercise space for their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen H Uyenco **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6167 **Comment Id:** 365707 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as their have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits' creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6169 **Comment Id:** 365718 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as their have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits' creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

Organization:

Commenter: Danielle Kirby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6173 **Comment Id:** 365723 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. The SEIS calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as their have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits' creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

Organization:

Commenter: Chelsey Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6268 **Comment Id:** 366368 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Since the number of dogs using the open areas is fixed (or only slightly variable), if you remove the majority of the open areas impact will be focused and magnified in those areas. This will lead to more complaints from people who are afraid of dogs and the eventual removal of all off leash walking in GGNRA. Dog walking will then be concentrated on the few remaining bay area parks that allow off leash walking, and the cycle will repeat itself. Diffusion of impact is a better solution.

Organization:

Commenter: Miles Pickering **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6608 **Comment Id:** 367155 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: WHEREAS, Muir Beach restrictions may result in significant displacement impacts on Marin County-owned Little Beach

Organization: Marin County Board of Supervisors

Commenter: Kathrin Sears **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6609 **Comment Id:** 367174 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm highly concerned about the proposed leash-only areas and am wondering what the ramifications will be? How many altercations will ensue? How crowded will the off-leash parks around me become? Whan about parking? How will my dog get her exercise? How will I get my exercise? The questions are endless. The reasons to pass the plan are few and unproven.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Schulting **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6623 **Comment Id:** 367480 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: By severely restricting dogs to ever smaller areas, it becomes a self fulfilling prophecy that there will be problems. You put more pressure on the dogs to interact in smaller spaces. People who love their dogs will drive as far as they need to for off leash areas. By limiting people in Marin and San Francisco you force them to converge on areas where off leash use is allowed. More dogs in smaller spaces will lead to more conflict.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa Eshman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6448 **Comment Id:** 367511 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

Organization:

Commenter: Solomon Waters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367531 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in a smaller area (Central Beach and a small portion of the Grassy Airfield). This makes no sense and is setting up the dog management plan for failure.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6505 **Comment Id:** 367597 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In particular, the SEIS is seriously inadequate in addressing the impact of such severe restrictions on nearby city and state parks, as well as the proposed remaining off-leash areas in GGNRA. Many dogs require regular off leash running to get adequate exercise - and sufficient exercise is perhaps the most important element in having a well behaved dog. Under the Preferred Alternative, more dogs will be concentrated into smaller off leash areas - in GGNRA as well as in local parks.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6505 **Comment Id:** 367598 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Established packs of dogs may get along well in a small space; concentrating a number of unfamiliar dogs, even friendly ones, in a space can raise the arousal and tension levels, resulting in increased dog fights, aggressive pack behavior, etc. The parks I visit are already frequently crowded in the off leash areas; early mornings are about the only time I can count on avoiding crowded conditions. Restricting off leash areas in GGNRA will result in higher concentrations of dogs in the remaining off leash areas in GGNRA as well as in local parks, compounding the problem.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6509 **Comment Id:** 367619 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a citizen of this city and a dog owner myself, I have lived here long enough to see more and more local dog parks overcrowded and prohibiting off leash parks only make the overcrowding worse. Overcrowding can lead to many issues such as more frequent dog fights, lost dogs, improper cleaning up after dogs and handlers not being able to focus on their dogs to maintain order. Don't take away our off leash parks!!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6646 **Comment Id:** 368213 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Organization:

Commenter: Les Nagy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4506 **Comment Id:** 368683 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Organization:

Commenter: kathryn Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6565 **Comment Id:** 368697 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The draft plan/SEIS also overlooks the commonsense fact that by severely limiting the off-leash space in the GGNRA, dog owners and their pets will be squeezed into much smaller municipal park areas of local communities, which will increase potential conflicts and negative impacts. This is also true of forcing people with dogs into much smaller areas within the GGNRA itself.

Organization:

Commenter: Shannon Yodowitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6537 **Comment Id:** 368713 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are tens of thousands of dogs in the area that will need to be exercised. It is not a responsible action to so severely limit dog access in the GGNRA lands, amidst an urban and suburban area, putting undue pressure on a small number of Marin County trails and lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Margaret Davies **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1071 **Comment Id:** 368724 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Additionally, restricting off-leash areas at GGNRA will cause overcrowding of other dog parks and a negative or unsafe experience for dog(s

Organization:

Commenter: Janet Slissman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1071 **Comment Id:** 368729 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS is not valid because it does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The SF Supervisors and dog walkers asked for a thorough analysis. It is my belief that reducing off-leash dog walking areas will negatively impact other dog parks or adjacent lands through overcrowding and you have not adequately analyzed the impact.

Organization:

Commenter: Janet Slissman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1137 **Comment Id:** 368738 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth B Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1138 **Comment Id:** 368744 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Mario Yovkov **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1139 **Comment Id:** 368753 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Alan Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1236 **Comment Id:** 368760 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The SF Supervisors and dog walkers asked for a thorough analysis. What we got was cursory at best.(

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368779 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: DEIS comments and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors asked GGNRA to analyze the effects on City parks of draconian reductions to off-leash access in the GGNRA, the SEIS does not do so. GGNRA simply assumes people will continue to use GGNRA sites, accepting on-leash access in place of off-leash access, and accepting small ROLAs in place of room to walk with dogs. That assumption is most unlikely.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4287 **Comment Id:** 368819 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: You TOTALLY ignore the impacts that these policies will have on the surrounding areas. If you squeeze dogs out of GGNRA lands were will they go? To overloaded City Parks ? Have you involved the City in this plan? You also have totally ignored the beneficial and human impacts of off leash interaction with ones pet. As I mentioned above, My mother cannot run so why are you wanting to limit the dogs exercise level to hers? She currently can play with our border collie and use a chuck-it with minimum effort for her and maximum effort for the dog. When I go to the park I see people playing with the dogs of all ages, races and, presumably, financial background. I do not see anything in your study except a rather curious reference to minorities not coming to the parks because of dogs - The DEIS cites a 2007 SF State study that claims all Latinos and Asians surveyed said that dogs were a problem but if you actually read the study you discover some things: a) the study was not, as the DEIS implies an ethnic minority visitor use experience at the GGNRA but was actually a study born to help connect minorities to the parks. But more damning the study was hardly a scientific one - they interviewed fewer that 100 people and they were not randomly selected. It is this kind of selective scientific use that will have the words Drakes Estero popping up in peoples minds.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Norton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6577 **Comment Id:** 368858 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I feel that doing so would only encourage dog owners to scatter into neighborhood parks or on streets, which would probably make an impact on them all in forms of dog poop and probably more dog fights between leashed dogs. I've

Organization:

Commenter: Eleanor G Burke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369490 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The DEIS failed to meet NEPA requirements by omitting an analysis of the effects of the proposed change on park properties in the cities and counties where the GGNRA

now owns large swaths of recreational resources. However, when reading the DETS, it seems pretty clear what the effect would be. From the DEIS itself: High numbers ofincidents occur because of the large number ofpeople that use the site at one time, and the high number of dogs offleash at the site.. Certainly the GGNRA would acknowledge that this is precisely what will happen to parks outside the GGNRA should they close down 90% of the GGNRAs offleash acreage as the Preferred Alternative would do. This is an unacceptable outcome. A phone or written survey and the addition of some analysis in the new SEIS does not change the numbers of users or the size of the properties they will be forced to utilize. The outcome is still unacceptable.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6559 **Comment Id:** 369560 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It also fails to acknowledge the self-evident fact that by restricting off-leash activity in the GGNRA, the draft plan/SEIS will force dog owners and their pets into smaller and less available city dog parks, which will become more congested and increase potential conflicts.

Organization:

Commenter: Joel Yodowitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6584 **Comment Id:** 369577 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: At least 10,000 dogs visit the GGNRA every day. San Francisco city parks are much, much smaller than the GGNRA and will be unable to absorb the impact of all those dogs if they are forced out of the GGNRA. The negative impact on parks and other recreation areas in San Francisco and Mann far outweighs any potential negative impacts in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369648 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE SEIS DOES NOT ADEQUATELY ANALYZE IMPACTS ON NEARBY CITY PARKS The GGNRA does not exist in a vacuum. It is located within and immediately adjacent to San Francisco, a city of some 800,000 people. Actions that it takes will impact neighboring cities. In 2011, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution opposing the DEIS Preferred Alternative, and urging the GGNRA to delay taking action on its proposal until a thorough study was conducted of the effect the proposal would have on San Francisco city parks. Unfortunately, the SETS does not provide the thorough study requested by the City. The SEIS says, on p. 354, that: It is very likely than an increase in the level of recreational use by private and commercial dog walking will occur at nearby dog walking areas outside of GGNRA as a result of this draft plan/SEIS. However it is speculative to precisely identify all potential impacts from redistribution related to the implementation of this draft

plan/SEIS... This claim of speculative impacts is ironic since the SEIS discussion of impacts on vegetation and wildlife contain repeated references to speculative impacts for dogs that might, could, or may occur. In discussing impacts on nearby parks, the SETS primarily identifies (or tries to identifr) which parks people will visit if forced out of the GGNRA. The SEIS does contain a list of parks in San Francisco, Mann, and San Mateo Counties where people who want to walk their dogs off-leash might go if they could no longer walk in the GGNRA (pp. 343-349). The list describes basic physical conditions at these parks, e.g., vegetation present, parking, etc. But there is no mention of current usage at any of the parks. How many people currently walk in each park with their dog? The SEIS does not say. Without this information it is impossible to know whether the movement of tens or hundreds or thousands of people and their dogs from the GGNRA into each park would have a serious impact or not. A thorough analysis would have provided this information.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369649 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We know from Tsunami Friday, as reported in my DEIS comment, that when the GGNRA closed all of Fort Funston and Ocean Beach on March 11, 2011 after an earthquake in Japan, usage at Pine Lake/Stern Grove, the closest off-leash area in a nearby park to both GGNRA sites, increased tenfold. Parking was described as chaotic. While the GGNRAs Preferred Alternative will not close all of Fort Funston and Ocean Beach to people with dogs, it will close approximately 75% of each area to all dogs, even those on-leash. The SETS should have explored current usage at nearby parks, but it did not. The SEIS does not adequately address how many people who normally walk dogs in the GGNRA will be affected by the Preferred Alternatives proposed closures of off-leash space, a crucial point in any thorough study of impacts on nearby parks. For example, Table 10, p. 309 of the SETS, lists the results of the two on-site visitor surveys about usage at six GGNRA sites. However the results are listed as percentages, e.g., what percent of visitors surveyed were there to walk dogs. There is no account of the total number of visitors, so theres no way to know how many people are actually walking dogs at each site. For example, Table 10 says 62.1% of visitors to Fort Funston were there to walk dogs. Setting aside the severe undercounting of this number as outlined in the section above, to understand impacts on nearby parks caused by the closure of large parts of Fort Funston, you need to know the actual number of people affected, not just a percentage. 62.1% of 1,000 people means closures will impact significantly fewer people than 62.1% of 10,000 people. Thus it is impossible to tell from the SEIS if the proposed closures of off-leash space at Fort Funston will move 62 people into nearby parks or 6,200. Similarly, the question of whether or not the off-leash space that will remain at GGNRA sites like Fort Funston will be adequate to accommodate the number of people who walk there now cannot be answered from information provided in the SETS. If its 62 people, the severely reduced area likely would be okay, but if its 6,200 people, then the remaining off-leash will not adequately serve the recreational needs of that many dog walkers. The issue of how many people will be affected at each site must be quantified before any analysis can be accepted, and the SETS did not do that.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369650 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS also does not adequately address the fact that off-leash areas in nearby parks are significantly smaller than similar areas in the GGNRA now. The SEIS says that under the Preferred Alternative, off-leash areas at GGNRA sites would be reduced by approximately 107 acres (p. 373). This does not include the acreage included in the loss of 30.9 miles of off-leash access on trails, roads, and beaches. So the total acreage of off-leash areas closed by the Preferred Alternative will be much higher. Ironically, the acreage of off-leash areas closed by the Preferred Alternative is actually greater than the total legal off-leash acreage in San Francisco city parks. Table 5.1 of the Final Draft of the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP) of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (RPD) (p. 5- 24) lists the total DPA (Dog Play Area, or legal off-leash area) acreage on RPD property as 117.5 acres. However, the Natural Areas Program, for which the SNRAMP is its management plan, proposes to close over 14 acres of DPA space to off-leash recreation. Therefore, the total acreage of off-leash space in San Francisco city parks, after SN RAMP, is 103.24 acres, less than the non-beach-road-and-trails acreage lost because of restrictions in the GGNRA Preferred Alternative. This shows the scale of the loss of off-leash space in the GGNRA when compared to available offleash space in San Francisco city parks. The SEIS should have included this information, but it did not. The SEIS says, on p. 372, that: Visitors who currently visit Fort Funston would likely continue to take their dogs to Fort Funston for off-leash dog walking, despite the decrease in the area available for off-leash dog walking, compared to Alternative A. Similar comments are made at every site under consideration - if there is any off-leash space still available at a site, no matter how small, people with dogs will continue to walk in the GGNRA, and not move to nearby parks. Similarly, the SEIS says (p. 373): However, the movement of visitors under the preferred alternative is anticipated to be low, since five GGNRA sites would still provide off-leash dog walking in ROLAs, all the sites considered for dog walking would allow areas for onleash dog walking, and none of the sites would prohibit dogs. Yet the SEIS offers no rationale for these statements.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369651 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Clearly, the GGNRA did not listen to comments from dog walkers in response to the DEIS. Dog walkers made it clear in their DEIS comments that there is a qualitative difference between walking with a dog on-leash and off-leash. To assume, as the SEIS does, that someone accustomed to walking off-leash at a site will continue to walk there because there is still on-leash access available is ridiculous. Dog walkers made it clear that they enjoy walking long distances with their dogs on trails in the GGNRA. To assume, as the SETS does, that someone used to walking long distances with their dog will be content to walk much shorter distances in the significantly smaller off-leash areas at sites like Fort Funston is ridiculous. To assume, as the SETS does, that people used to walking in one long loop, where they do not pass the same site twice, will be content to make repeated loops in much smaller off-leash areas,

passing the same scenery over and over again, is ridiculous. Yet the SETS makes those assumptions. Had they listened to the DEIS comments, the SETS would not make statements that few visitors would move to nearby parks because there will still be small off-leash and/or on-leash areas available. As flawed as the 2012 GGNRA Dog Walking Satisfaction Visitor Study was, it does say that nearly all dog walkers who responded (98%) d be only moderately or less than moderately satisfied if they were not able to walk their dogs off-leash at the sites they frequent now (p. 339 in the SEIS). It is reasonable to assume that people who are used to walking many miles throughout Fort Funston with their dog off-leash will not be satisfied to be restricted to the significantly smaller off-leash areas proposed in the Preferred Alternative. And people who are unsatisfied will go somewhere else. In other words they will move to nearby city parks. Because the SEIS does not include an adequate analysis of impacts on nearby parks, as requested by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and in many DEIS public comments, including mine, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/30/2014)

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments (Substantive)

1. **One commenter believes that the high usage of the park by dog owners and dog walkers helps to reduce the presence of marijuana growers, which is a large problem in national parks.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1014 **Comment Id:** 351435 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: One of the most pervasive problems in national parks is the presence of marijuana growers. High traffic keeps these guys at bay. Dogs have to be walked every day. Which means that they are in a park evey single day, creating safety zones wherever they go. The trade off is a little poop, trash cleanup and the occasional dust up. Weighed against pollution from fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, water theft from streams and dangerous heavily armed criminals wandering around, it seems like a relatively inexpensive means of protecting an area.

Organization:

Commenter: Sandra J Bulman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Many commenters expressed concern about the increased traffic that the new restrictions would cause. Dog owners would be traveling longer distances to take their dogs to off leash areas, increasing congestion, emissions, and impacts on the off leash areas. One commenter stated that current traffic conditions are already a concern.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1343 **Comment Id:** 352366 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To summarize, Fort Funston is THE ONLY place where we feel comfortable taking our dogs off leash. It's the only place where a dog can really run and be off leash without us being worried about car traffic and pedestrians. Because of this we make the 7 mile drive every weekend. Its just a very special place where dogs can socialize wit other dogs and get the real exercise they deserve as pets

Organization:

Commenter: justin velo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1896 **Comment Id:** 354498 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And finally, this will impact not only my dogs quality of life but mine as well. With less places to walk my dog, I will have to drive farther which impacts emissions. More fuel burned, more cars on the roads per dog owner. Consider the number of people with dogs, how many added cars that is to the streets because we have to drive daily to give our dogs exercise.

Organization:
Commenter: Amanda Whichard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6167 **Comment Id:** 365706 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force our community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to/from Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. The potential effects on socioeconomics from changes in the off leash restrictions are a concern for many commenters. People who visit Golden Gate national Recreation Area specifically for use of the off leash areas are likely to frequent other areas if the restrictions are put into place. This would affect the local businesses.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1504 **Comment Id:** 352933 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I also worry about the unintended economic and environmental impacts of these decisions. There are thousands of dog owners who use the GGRA every day. If they are no longer able to use this space, they may move to locations that do, which will negatively affect both real estate prices and local business. This is especially true given the fact that many pet owners are high income and highly mobile individuals or couples. Even if they dont move, they will likely drive to locations where their dogs can freely play, increasing both congestion and air pollution.
Organization:
Commenter: Matthew S Oresman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1525 **Comment Id:** 353004 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Several times a year we have mini vacations (weekend stays) in San Francisco largely due to the abundance of off leash areas in which we are able to relax with our dog. If the off leash areas are removed from San Francisco we will be less likely to go to San Francisco and spend our money there. If off leash areas are removed we will be more likely to take our tourist business to other cities like Carmel by the sea.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Hopewell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

4. **One commenter considers the requirement of a 6-foot leash to be an issue, stating that retractable leashes can provide a better experience for the dog while still allowing the owner to control the dog.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1682 **Comment Id:** 353556 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I also want to say something about leash specifications. We have an adjustable leash for our dog that works VERY well. We make it short when we are passing strange dogs and people, and let it out long when we are away from others. It is unacceptable and narrow-minded to limit leashes to a single (short) length. A responsible dog walker can do perfectly well around both unfriendly humans and dogs with an adjustable leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1682 **Comment Id:** 353569 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My last point has to do with the definition of leashed. When hiking or running, it is MUCH easier on both the dog and human to use a retractable leash of about 12. We have hiked/run hundreds of miles with our dog and we know. He does not wander off the trail to any extent that the habitat would be damaged any more than if he were on a 6 leash, and he is perfectly under control when meeting other people or dogs o the trail because we just pull up on the length of the leash. Am I really going to be ticketed on these trails using my retractable leash, when my dog NEVER strays more than a foot to either side of the trail/road?

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. **One commenter is concerned about the impact of increased noise at community dog parks from dogs barking and owners calling for their dogs. Conversely, other commenters does not believe that noise from people recreating with their dogs can be distinguished from the other noises associated with a large city setting such as San Francisco.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 3994 **Comment Id:** 360399 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sound pollution from barking dogs? Maybe, if you can hear over the crashing waves, the steady stream of planes departing SFO, and the constant gunfire from The Pacific Rod and Gun Club at Lake Merced.

Organization:

Commenter: Bjorn Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6135 **Comment Id:** 365580 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For a large concentration of dogs to collect in the middle of a residential area

would lead to a dramatically noisy situations in which barking dogs would disturb all nearby residents. If unacquainted dogs of different breeds, size and sexes mix in this small area, there will be many dog conflicts and much barking. If dogs are under "voice command" and not a leash, that means owners will have to be shouting commands. This will be a major disturbance to the quiet of the street.

Organization: Tamarind Street Resident

Commenter: Linda L Rutherford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

6. Commenters are concerned about the impact the new dog regulations would have on the sense of community that is harbored by a variety of people coming together in common spaces to exercise their dogs.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 4689 **Comment Id:** 361337 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: But beyond this, the fact is, *dogs foster neighborhood community in these spaces*. From the stiffest businessman to the most eccentric animal fanatic, we meet and talk and become friends and better neighbors in these off leash areas. These off-leash areas are the spontaneous town halls of San Francisco's pet owning community.

Organization:

Commenter: Siobhan Quinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5270 **Comment Id:** 362848 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Another impact which the SEIS fails to consider is the impact on the local community culture. San Mateo Countys coastal communities are communities of dog lovers. Rancho is more than just an open space area. It is a community space where people go with their dogs to walk and to catch up with their neighbors and friends. In many ways, Rancho is the heart of our community. If dogs are banned except for on a few trails, GGNRA will be gutting the very thing that makes it enjoyable to live here.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine C Cowdery **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

7. Commenters are troubled by the lack of recognition of Golden Gate National Recreation Area as an urban environment. The commenters believe that the national recreation area should be treated as such, not on the same level as national parks. GGNRA provides open space between urban neighborhoods, not a wilderness experience.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6430 **Comment Id:** 367014 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: GGNRA should be a partner with the City of San Francisco and other communities, not act as an adversary. The DEIS doesnt recognize that many areas of the

GGNRA are located in or next to urban neighborhoods. The DEIS excludes the quality of the urban environment from its scope, saying its not significant. The GGNRA provides much needed open space in a major urban area. This omission is disconcerting because the fundamental purpose of creating the GGNRA was to provide open space for recreation (including dog walking as a form of recreation) to serve the metropolitan Bay Area. The dynamic interrelationship between GGNRA and our neighborhoods is exactly the human environment that the EIS is required to study, but failed to do so.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4005 **Comment Id:** 368798 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: GGNRA has numerous features that have been designed and built by humans, from trails, to signage, to parking lots and buildings and other facilities, to habitat restoration projects. It includes many constructed environments, including former military installations and city parks. GGNRA is not a wilderness. GGNRA is in many respects a designed landscape. Even efforts to restore its natural values involve urban design components, such as vegetated berm separation and other design features to preserve its resources and values. It is hard to imagine how the SDEIS could dismiss "urban quality" as not relevant (page 24): "Consideration of this topic is required by 40 CFR 1502.16. The quality of urban areas is not a significant factor in determining a dog management policy for GGNRA. No new building construction or rehabilitation of existing structures is proposed under the alternatives presented in this draft plan/SEIS; therefore, this topic has been dismissed from further analysis. " (emp. added) This statement in the SDEIS misinterprets CEQ rules and results in basic noncompliance with NEPA. GGNRA is in an urban area; it was established to improve urban quality of life; the design of this urban parkland could not be more relevant. The design of urban parks is a recognized discipline. Good design is central to the ability to preserve park resources and values, including recreation, ecology, and cultural values. This one paragraph from the SDEIS, quoted above, dismissing urban quality and design of the urban environment, highlights the absence of rigorous expiration of alternatives, as required by NEPA, CEQ, DOI and NPA NEPA rules, procedures and guidance. It also demonstrates the document's bias in treating GGNRA like a traditional national park and not as an urban unit of the national park system. NPS/GGNRA seems out of its comfort zone here, but this doesn't excuse the omission.

Organization:

Commenter: Kenneth S Weiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 407 **Comment Id:** 351326 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: A few points that I would like to draw to your attention: -dogs and dog areas promote community building as it allows for owners, walkers and the general public a chance to meet in a comfortable area -controlled areas will in time develop anomisty, stress, and a brewing sense of angst within the community

Organization:

Commenter: Shaun Steingold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1459 **Comment Id:** 352812 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this goes through it could have a damaging impact on our property values and resale potential.

Organization:

Commenter: Harrison Westwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 712 **Comment Id:** 353009 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a resident of Moss Beach for approximately 27 years and have walked my dogs off leash in what is known as Rancho Corral Di Tierro, and have never had a problem with horseback riders and the occasional hiker, Being a horse owner myself, it is common knowledge to put your dog(s) on a leash when you see some one on horse back. There are so many horse owners who also love to bring their dog(s) with them when they are riding, which is good exercise for their horse and their dog, if you restrict dogs to leashes only in this area behind the hospital, I am afraid the ranches in the area would lose their boarders.

Organization:

Commenter: Carol Scatena **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1553 **Comment Id:** 353092 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Just saw on www.dogtrekker.com that dog access will be severely limited soon in SF's Golden Gate parks. We have avoided travelling in California in the past due to what we felt were too stringent dog restrictions. We always travel south for a 1 or 2 month camping trip in Oct. - Nov and head to set up base camp in areas that are dog friendly....if you changes your dog rules in the golden gates area we won't be visiting. Please keep your parks dog friendly!

Organization:

Commenter: Lorna Doucette **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1567 **Comment Id:** 353115 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please don't close our parks to dogs and the people who love them!!!! I drive into San Francisco every weekend to take my dog to Fort Funston, shop at the local mall, and have a meal at a local dog friendly restaurant. Without this park there will be no reason for people like me to support this area.

Organization:

Commenter: Nick Bergmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1825 **Comment Id:** 353197 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Finally, I don't want to have to drive long distances to let my dog run.

Organization:

Commenter: Joshua Davis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1650 **Comment Id:** 353251 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Its not a pristine wilderness. Rather, it is a multi use urban park. Please don't legislate the fiction that it is anything else. To do so will deprive a large number of people and animals a sense of belonging to it, a sense of guardianship towards it, and a chance to experience its specialness.

Organization:

Commenter: Irene Gustafson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 906 **Comment Id:** 353622 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It is important that you consider that the SEIS alternatives will instead require us to drive to other Marin areas to walk our pets. Existing traffic already impacts the ease of travel and the congestion and pollution we experience. We do not need changes which will make travel worse.

Organization:

Commenter: Sally Peck **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1806 **Comment Id:** 354113 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We make multiple trips a month to visit that beach with our dog. We often eat at near by restaurants as well. It would be a real shame for those business to loose business because of a bad decision.

Organization:

Commenter: Eric Rees **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1833 **Comment Id:** 354296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What is the waterside boundary at National Parks' beaches? Mean high-high tideline is the usual property line designator. If that is the case with National Parks, then the land between the low tideline and the mean high-high mark is outside the jurisdiction of the Park Services and would be governed, instead, by any applicable Maritime or National Marine Sanctuary laws.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 1966 **Comment Id:** 354629 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We commonly support Marin county businesses when we come. For example, today we went to Pelican Inn and up the coast to Marin Sun Farms for expensive meals. We will have little reason to frequent Marin County if there are no beautiful trails we can enjoy with our dog. Consider all the tourism dollars that will be lost by dog owners like us.

Organization:

Commenter: Wyatt L Du Frane **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1977 **Comment Id:** 354641 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We would no longer visit these areas if he could not run off leash, and this would definitely lead to a reduced awareness and economic benefit for all of the surround businesses and the concessions within the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea E Gaffney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1999 **Comment Id:** 354668 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For me, this is one of the best things about living in Marin, and if I was unable to enjoy these areas with my dog, and the extremely limited area with which she travels with me through the trail system, I would seriously consider selling my home and leaving the area altogether.

Organization:

Commenter: Zachariah Murphy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4193 **Comment Id:** 355969 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In October, 1977, Rolf Diamont, GGNRA "Environmental Coordinator" prepared a memo proposing a "Draft Dog Policy for San Francisco Unit." His memo enumerated the following guidelines: 1. "No regulation, verbal or written, should be attempted that cannot be reasonably and consistently administered." 2. "Dog regulations should be different for different

areas of the park reflecting public needs and attitudes as well as urban geography and our capabilities." 3. "When we discourage or restrict dogs in any area, whenever possible, an a.lter.native site where dogs are allowed should be suggested.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4465 **Comment Id:** 356003 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In fact, we are the ones who contribute to the local economies when using these spaces. We strengthen the economy with each trip we make to these recreation areas. We and our pets are assets and not liabilities.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Janet Gregori **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2602 **Comment Id:** 356859 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We make a day of it. We meet up with friends and enjoy long walks along Fort Funston or whichever other fun park is close by the friend we are visiting that day. After the dogs have had their fun, my husband and I go out to eat at a local restaurant. Because the city is welcoming to our "fur children" we spend a lot of time up there with friends and we are also stimulating the economy by eating and shopping there. I'm not sure how often we would make it up there if it wasn't a place for our whole family.

Organization:

Commenter: Brenna N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3030 **Comment Id:** 357731 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: So let's examine a family from El Granada who have a couple of dogs (very typical for a Coastside family). Currently that family can walk from their house and walk their dogs in Rancho Corral de Tierra: Net result, no carbon dioxide emissions for transport.Under the new scheme this same family will have to drive as far as Fort Funston to walk the same dogs off-leash. And I can assure from talking to people that many will make that journey. That is a sixty mile round trip. Let's say they do that twice a week and get 30 miles to the gallon in their minivan. That means over 200 gallons of fuel each year. Which means about 3800 pounds of CO_2 per year. And let's say we have a thousand family in this situation on the Coastside alone (a low estimate). That is nearly 4 MILLION POUNDS of CO_2 per year from the Coastside alone. All a consequence of this so-called "Preferred" environmental plan!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3818 **Comment Id:** 359901 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We love to bring our dog to S.F. for the day so he can play at the beach and we can eat the wonderful restaurants. If all dog owners have to leave their dog at home in order to enjoy the City, we probably won't come as often and spend our money closer to home.
Organization:
Commenter: RJ Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3976 **Comment Id:** 360339 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.
Organization:
Commenter: Brendan Hickey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5188 **Comment Id:** 362543 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Limiting beach off-leash access to the remote Rodeo Beach is ridiculous- and shows how truly insensitive your plan is to the environment- residents will have to drive their cars to this remote location- adding to carbon emissions, pollution and wasted time and energy.
Organization:
Commenter: Alice A Gleghorn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5520 **Comment Id:** 363893 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting these areas would force more people on the roads which are already congested. Have you seen Route 1/Shoreline highway congestion on the weekends??? It is so back up already and now these new STUPID LIGHTS have made it even worse and now even through the week it backs up. If you close these areas it is only going to get worse.
Organization:
Commenter: Shelley Losch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5551 **Comment Id:** 363937 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Not having these trails, will force me to use my car and drive further distances something I rarely do now. This will impact the carbon footprint that we also must look to for a healthy future
Organization:
Commenter: Maria C Ask-Hed **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5638 **Comment Id:** 364059 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I know we are not the only one of our dog loving friends and family who will not be contributing to the local economy of Marin county if you restrict our whole family access by not allowing our dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Jamie Coughlan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5969 **Comment Id:** 364833 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Further, restricting access in this manner will force Marin residents to have to drive further afield in order to exercise their dogs off-leash. This is not a particularly green alternative, and will increase traffic and pollution.

Organization:

Commenter: Gillian Manning **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6049 **Comment Id:** 365249 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The current plan is far too restrictive, especially for Marin and San Mateo counties. Dog people with cars will have to drive farther for off-leash exercise, making regional traffic worse and greatly impacting the remaining off-leash areas. Please do not vote for the plan as it is currently configured.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia S Adler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6092 **Comment Id:** 365404 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I very strongly oppose the plan put forth by the GGNRA to ban dogs from Muir Beach as well as from the hiking trails. Not only will this harm local businesses that I currently frequent when I take my dog to these locations, but it will also concentrate more dog owners to fewer places, increasing congestion and causing over-use.

Organization:

Commenter: Harald Loeffler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6109 **Comment Id:** 365425 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, the SEIS preferred alternatives, as suggested by the GGNRA, force people into their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

Organization: Soulmates Animal Care

Commenter: Kathleen E Denison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6169 **Comment Id:** 365717 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force our community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to/from Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA
Organization:
Commenter: Danielle Kirby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6703 **Comment Id:** 365781 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Will result in significant adverse impact under NEPA to community environment cohesion
Organization:
Commenter: Ardine Zazzera **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6608 **Comment Id:** 367152 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: WHEREAS, the SEIS does not adequately address the impacts on county parks and open space, or traffic in neighboring communities as a result of implementing Alternative F
Organization: Marin County Board of Supervisors
Commenter: Kathrin Sears **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6645 **Comment Id:** 368201 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Lastly, as we mentioned in our May 2011 letter, we are concemed that a loss of on-leash dog access on lands within Pacifica might have unwanted economic consequences, as dog walkers will go elsewhere, effectively eliminating the possibility of patronizing Pacificas restaurants, hotels, or other retail outlets. While this cannot be readily quantified, we wish to express our concerns about this possibility, as it has been the City's long-held desire to see just the opposite occur.
Organization: Pacifica City Council
Commenter: Mary Nihart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368236 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Overall the proposed management plan that will reduce dog access area by over 75% is too restrictive and is not taking into consideration the impacts on local dog parks, roads,

additional air pollution and the limited space you are considering. Many of the proposed areas to continue off leash dog walking are less accessible and do not take into consideration the guardians that have limited mobility that need to exercise and enjoy their dogs. Fenced in off leash areas are too small, generally have surfaces that are either harmful to the paws of running dogs or muddy and do not allow us to hike and exercise with our dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 344 **Comment Id:** 368337 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I advise you to read the editorial in the S.F. Examiner paper of Sunday Nov.10 2013.It can be found in The City Section[pg.6]It expresses my sentiments completely and that of my many neighbors and friends.The author is Joel Engardio.His blog is at www.engardio.com and his Email is jengardio@sfexaminer.com. Please check this out and make your fellow workers aware of it.

Organization:

Commenter: John B Arnaudo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 804 **Comment Id:** 368721 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Page 20 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement concerns Soundscapes, and notes The natural sounds heard in GGNRA are a positive and valued park resource, as well as a component of the visitor experience, which dog barking may interrupt. As a native San Franciscan who grew up in the Sunset, is a graduate of South Sunset Tiny Tots, Ulloa Elementary School, A. P. Gianinni Junior High School, and Lowell High School, who has lived within earshot of Fort Funston for nearly half of a century, I believe I have standing to point-out the obvious: in reference to Fort Funston, the idea of natural soundscapes is completely undercut by its location under a flight path of SFO, next to a highway, and across the street from the San Francisco Police Department Pistol Range and the Pacific Rod and Gun Club trap and skeet shooting range. It is disingenuous to use this canard to try to exclude dogs from any part of Fort Funston.

Organization:

Commenter: Dean G Kardassakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1236 **Comment Id:** 368763 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SEIS will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. The only site-specific consensus agreement to come out of Negotiated Rulemaking was to allow off-leash dog walking on a trail in Oakwood Valley in Marin. This was included in the DEIS. However, it was removed from the SEIS (Oakwood Valley is now proposed to be on-leash only) because the GGNRA decided that there would be no off-leash dog walking on any trail. All the money and work that went into Negotiated Rulemaking was wasted.(

Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4005 **Comment Id:** 368799 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: One of the reasons NEPA requires a "systematic interdisciplinary approach" with an "integrated use" the "environmental design arts" as well as sciences is that the design disciplines can help solve environmental problems. NEPA Section 102(2)(A) and corresponding Interior and NPS requirements. This has essentially not occurred with the planning process or SDEIS to date. There are many examples where design can avoid or otherwise mitigate potential user conflicts or impairment of resources. Many of the conflicts noted in SDEIS, whether real or perceived, could be addressed with good urban design, such as access to specific areas, separation of areas where people and dogs, people only, or no one is allowed, how a user "understands" where people and dogs or other users are allowed, and so on. The fact that the proposed plan does not propose new buildings is not relevant to the NEPA requirement to evaluate urban quality and design. If these alternatives and mitigation measures are not rigorously explored, both the planning and EIS process are inadequate. Good urban design is at the heart of a balanced plan - yet NPS has "dismissed this from further analysis."(page 24). This work needs to be done. San Francisco and the Bay Area are known for their attention to urban design and to sustainability principles and have many talented design professionals. NPS and GGNRA will not have difficulty bringing the required resources to bear on this plan and EIS. An adequate plan and EIS needs to recognize that this plan is about the quality and design of the urban environment, and not dismiss it as irrelevant and remove it from the scope of the analysis.
Organization:
Commenter: Kenneth S Weiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6474 **Comment Id:** 368832 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please address the fact that the SEIS is using a subjective unenforceable definition and standard for "controlled" dogs. Please identify a scientific basis for using "controlled" to define behavior that is not definite and is variable for each dog subject to the standard. Most, if not all, dogs will exhibit different behaviors in the context and presence of variable factors, including different humans, other dogs and multiple species of wildlife. Many dogs will exhibit erratic behavior if confronted by unfamiliar circumstances or circumstances that they perceive to threaten their owners/human companions. Please identify scientific evidence that supports the definition/standard that "controlled" as used to describe dogs is a reliable and effective standard to support a federal regulation.
Organization:
Commenter: Celeste Langille **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6584 **Comment Id:** 369581 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the

GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Mann County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6595 **Comment Id:** 369590 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The document still lacks appropriate analysis of recreational resources in the urban setting of the San Francisco Bay Area. NEPA requires that environmental impacts on the quality of the human environment be considered. They were not.

Organization:

Commenter: Antonia Sivyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/30/2014)

ND1100 Non Dog Related Impacts to Park Resources (Substantive)

1. **Commenters noted that the impacts of other visitors on resources are greater than or equal to those of dogs, including the impacts of the following park visitors: hikers, bikers (mountain and motorbike users), horses and horseback riders, kite boarders, skateboarders, young people, homeless people, picnickers, families, and children, among other user groups. These groups were reported to leave trash, disturb visitors, cause graffiti, impact sensitive resources, and cause safety concerns.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 276 **Comment Id:** 350455 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Don't even get me started about the amount of horse poop that's left along the running trails. I get police officers on horses help protect us but there are many other non-police horses that roam our trails and they don't appear to be under any mandate that they clean up after themselves. And the trash that people leave ALL OVER THE CITY and PARKS is a real issue, hazard to our health and unsightly mess.

Organization:

Commenter: Rachel Frederick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1008 **Comment Id:** 351417 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: But if we're doing our homework on this, I think you would find that hikers and other users of our trails within GGNRA have more complaints about the bike riders as they are always more aggressive and rude than any dog or dog owner.

Organization:

Commenter: Veronica E Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 719 **Comment Id:** 353037 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I was told by a ranger that it's not the chasing that's a problem but the trampling of their nests. If that is the case, then why don't we close the beach to people, with their careless children and their blankets and coolers and footballs. We have beach patrol in 4x4 trucks, cops on motorcycles, horses, wind pulled carts, tractors moving sand, thousands of walkers, runners and every possible type of beach goer imaginable. If this is really about saving birds then lets do it right and close the entire beach to everything and everyone. Why are we singling out a mostly harmless factor without any formal studies showing that dogs are responsible for a decline in bird population.

Organization:

Commenter: Matt Brewer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 812 **Comment Id:** 353349 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I also find it fascinating that you are so worried about dog walking ruining the environment when I continually find used condums, human feces, used tampons and sanitary napkins as well as beer bottles, wine bottles and toilet paper all over the Presidio, Baker Beach, and even in the headlands on Alta trail. It is really disgusting and actually unsanitary. I take my kids walking with me and I worry about them touching some of the garbage I find out there.
Organization: Dog Adventures
Commenter: Lisa J Gates **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1755 **Comment Id:** 353738 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Bikers, birders, hikers all go off trail and there are many more of them but they keep being allowed on more land, while we are losing some of our most wonderful walkie places. I am a birder and can also attest to birders going off-path en masse to peer into nests and pishing to lure birds into the open
Organization:
Commenter: Sharon Salisbury **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2691 **Comment Id:** 357080 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Humans, on the other hand, who come for recreation, make a huge amount of trash, which is left not only in the trash bins, but all over the beach. I find bottles, toys, pieces of broken things, along with an array of food packaging. They start fires, let their kids run and scream, chasing birds and ciimbing all over the cliffs, and after all that, leave garbage on the beach.
Organization:
Commenter: Melissa J Flower **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3253 **Comment Id:** 358031 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I think you should focus your energy and efforts on the people riding dirt bikes up and down the hills, ruining the trails, frightening the equine and dog population, and scarring the hills. Dogs do not create the long lasting damage and havoc that dirt bikers do.
Organization:
Commenter: sheila fellows **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3994 **Comment Id:** 360391 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Hazardous and offensive dog waste from a handful of irresponsible dog owners? Possibly, but never mind the beach littered with horse waste and human trash, several homeless encampments, and storm water outflows that are covered top to bottom in graffiti.

Organization:

Commenter: Bjorn Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4799 **Comment Id:** 361559 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Conversely, there are people with children that disrupt public space and wildlife. They chase birds. They throw things. They have uncontrolled temper tantrums. Their actions are offensive to parents everywhere. Fortunately it's a small group. There are fishermen who station themselves at Ocean beach, blocking the water for for vast stretches from people and wildlife. Fortunately it's only a few most of the time. Groups of people discard trash carelessly, ruining parks and beaches for an overwhelming majority who don't behave so carelessly. I could go on citing any number of people behaving in a manner that is less than helpful.

Organization:

Commenter: Ben Dutro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters noted that the impacts of other wildlife, both native and non-native, on resources within the GGNRA are greater than or equal to the impacts of dogs, including impacts from coyotes, ravens, gulls, feral cats, mountain lions, and gophers.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1384 **Comment Id:** 352424 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The impact of humans and dogs at Fort Funston as I've observed appears to be less than that of the ravens and the wind. There used to be several bird species there: sparrows, swallows, gulls, hawks, even a pair of great horned owls. It was the ravens that impacted those species, not dogs. If not for the ravens pulling things out of the dustbins, there would be less paper and plastic on the ground as well.

Organization:

Commenter: Poe S Asher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2462 **Comment Id:** 358964 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am so tired of the Audubon Society blaming the dogs for everything. What about the coyotes, raccoons, skunks and crows that eat the eggs of shorebirds in the nesting areas. Should they have leashes?

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah A Hatch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362892 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In my many days at Crissy, I have never seen dogs chasing birds. They leave each other alone. There is a large group of geese that visit the big lawn regularly and this provides an environmental concern greater than the very rare and occasional dog (or even human!) poop. When our son was exposed to goose poop, he suffered serious diahrea that required antibiotic treatment.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5830 **Comment Id:** 364376 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The coyotes are more damaging to the birds than any dog I've ever seen in 20 years of going to Ocean Beach or Chrissy Field. The birds can fly away when anything goes near them.
Organization:
Commenter: Rowan R Chandler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5852 **Comment Id:** 364405 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Feral cats are far more damaging to bird populations in the Bay Area than dogs walking on the beach. Controlling feral cat populations would be a more effective way to help ensure healthy bird populations in the Bay Area.
Organization:
Commenter: George Theodoris **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364792 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Mountain lions: My dog has found enough parts of adult deer to make it clear that a large predator forages in this area. The S.F. Chronicle has reported mountain lion sightings in this area, and the local paper again on Nov. 13th
Organization:
Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6622 **Comment Id:** 367474 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Gophers cause more damage to plants than dogs do.
Organization:
Commenter: A. C Eisenberger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369405 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Beyond this, the California Gull is noted as being present. This is of interest because a recent study using surveillance cameras at plover nesting sites in San Francisco Bay documented California Gulls as being responsible for 25% of all predation of plover nests . (Robinson-Nilsen, Caitlin1, Jill Bluso Demers1, Cheryl Strong2, and Scott Demers 3; 1San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory, crobinson@sfbbo.org; 2 U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge; 3 HT Harvey and Associates DETERMINING THE EFFECTS OF HABITAT ENHANCEMENTS AND PREDATORS FOR WESTERN SNOWY PLOVER). California Gulls are new to some of these areas-could the decline in the number of plovers at Crissy Field be related to an increase in the presence of California Gulls? This study makes no attempt to ascertain if there is any such correlation.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Commenters noted that the impacts of natural forces on resources within the GGNRA are greater than equal to the impacts of dogs, including the impacts from wind, storms, erosion, and invasive species. Commenters felt these resources altered the habitat and impacted resources.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6287 **Comment Id:** 366430 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In fact I believe - and submit the same 'proof' - that both wind and natural erosion have changed the area around Fort Funston more so than any humans and their canine companions. Also seen over 2 decades is the unacceptable, illegal and rude behavior of weekend and holiday visitors and young school age children who swarm after school over the dunes through and into the existing fenced off areas of habitat recovery and dune ridge protection. Also the weekends and holidays leave more food-related trash than any amount of unclaimed dog poop during the rest of the year.

Organization:

Commenter: Seth Feigenbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2420 **Comment Id:** 368486 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It's my belief that people, natural erosion, rising sea level, man-made pollution, and urban sprawl are the greater factors at play (in terms of threatening our natural resources). I think the GGNRA should focus its concern with reducing pollution, maintaining trails, restoring native vegetation, providing community education and outreach, and monitoring (and fining) litterbugs who trash our resources.

Organization:

Commenter: bill randt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. Commenters noted that the impacts of human-based development and events, including NPS management of the GGNRA, on resources within the GGNRA are greater than or equal to the impacts of dogs, including the impacts from the following: races and runs, concerts, construction of parking lots and other amenities, nearby development, light pollution, fireworks, and NPS vehicle patrols, pollution, and past military uses.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 97 **Comment Id:** 339932 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: PROTECT the environment and those poor defenseless endangered birds, by banning the Blue Angels, the Americas Cup, massive construction on Doyle Drive, low flying coast guard helicopters, and all new construction in this 'park' area. Once you have done all of that, the birds will be much better off and you won't have to blame the dogs for all the world's problems.

Organization:

Commenter: Russ Cohn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 470 **Comment Id:** 351751 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA lands are within and adjacent to the urban landscape of San Francisco, where pollution and other urban factors directly impact the health of the environment. Dog use of the areas has minimal impact compared to other GGNRA-sanctioned activities, such as the building and maintenance of commercial buildings on the land - the Beach Hut, parking lots, East Beach bathrooms cafes - where visitors tourists are encouraged to visit

Organization:

Commenter: Kris Yee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1785 **Comment Id:** 353851 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In all my years of hiking on these trails I can't recall ever seeing any Park Service people out on foot on the trails either south of Muir Beach or North on the Owl Trail or the old Banducci Farm Rd. I've only seen them in NPS vehicles driving on the fire roads and creating large ruts when muddy. Certainly that is far more destructive of the environment than a few isolated people with dogs on leash. If you folks hardly ever walk these trails I don't see how you can justify prohibitng people like me from hiking with my dogs on leash. You can't possibly know what the conditions are or even if they affect the environment at all.

Organization: Muir Beach Community Services District

Commenter: Alex Johnston **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 962 **Comment Id:** 354166 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, at the same time GGNRA uses "preserving the environment" as a

reason for not allowing dogs off leash (without any scientific evidence that dogs have actually harmed anything), the park service continues to greatly disturb the environment with paved parking lots, proposals for more paved parking lots, concrete restrooms, and by finding ways to bring more and more people into the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara A Robertson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1868 **Comment Id:** 354400 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have also witnessed Park Law Enforcement personnel drive their vehicles in the Snowy Plover Protection Area and in most occasions at night, particularly in the zones where the Snowy Plovers nest/rest. This seems to be in complete violation of the Parks policies in the Protected Area and have direct negative impacts to the Snowy Plover nesting populations. Would like to recommend the Parks Service take action to restrict vehicle use in the Protected Area, particularly during the restricted seasons.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3783 **Comment Id:** 359691 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Vegetation near trails is impacted as much if not more by maintenance than dog incidents. For example, routine mowing along trails, creeks and fence lines may hurt bunch grasses more than all dog incidents. Perspective of impacts of dog walking in comparison to hiking, horseback riding and bicycling impacts seems to be missing in the SEIS, nor is there perspective offered on dog wastes in comparison to the wastes left behind by trail horses or wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4048 **Comment Id:** 360332 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The greatest threat to the natural environment are not dogs but housing development in Homestead Valley and the proposed Marin County Land Management Plan, particularly the proposed pile burning and herbicide applications.

Organization:

Commenter: JOHN EAGER **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4584 **Comment Id:** 360990 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS seems to select dog walking as a single threat to the GGNRA. What about the negative impact of very large groups that use the spaces (and take over large areas and

roadway access) for events, what about the terrible light pollution emitted from the sports facilities at the west end of Crissy Field ?

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Carboy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4329 **Comment Id:** 363783 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I passionately support habitat restoration but don't see current off-leash dog policy as a problem that negatively impacts this goal to the nearly the degree of other management issues. I have seen beautiful widespread pruning of Cypress trees, impressive to tourists and locals alike, negatively impact bat and song bird populations by allowing raccoons up into the high canopy and significantly reducing insect habitats. I love seeing coyotes catch a rodent meal yet this can cause a proportion of the digging damage blamed on dogs. I have also seen impacts of overnight camping negatively impact habitats to a lesser degree. I believe non-politicized and non-biased scientific studies would bear out these observations.

Organization:

Commenter: Tom Dallman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367538 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The year round special events at Crissy Field present the most significant environmental impact as many as several million people impact this area. It is not the dogs that have a significant impact here; it is the people and the heavily attended events such as Fleet Week, Americas Cup, corporate fundraisers, etc. that have a deeper and lasting impact on the environment. Additionally, the biggest safety concern at Crissy Field is the bicyclists, primarily tourists who blindly run into people along the promenade. The dogs and their owners are not a safety issue- -there isnt any empirical data in the DSEIS that supports that. I am not saying that there arent any situations that need attention, but the DSEIS is so biased against off leash dog walking you would think dogs present a daily hazard, which they do not.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368270 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The EIS/SEIS have not addressed the toxic conditions at Fort Funston; the ever changing erosion due to nature; the lack of any concerted effort by the GGNRA/NPS to preserve the fortifications from WW II; the lack of any attempt to remediate the conditions left by usage of the property as a Nike missile site; and also fails to address the damage done by people to Fort Funston (its not those dogs leaving graffitti and beer bottles); nor has either report addressed the contamination from waste water that flows beneath Fort Funston and the sewage discharges made in the vicinity by both Daly City and San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

5. Commenters expressed concern with the analysis presented in the SEIS regarding the impacts of dogs when compared to other sources of impacts.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 632 **Comment Id:** 352780 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The proposal to ban dogs on Crissy Field in order to protect wildlife/sensitive species is not consistent with the regular use of Crissy Field as an event space (e.g. for races/walks, Fleet Week, etc.).The document needs to be modified to present the impacts of dogs in proper context of all other uses of these same spaces. The document mischaracterizes dog's presence in the Wildlife Protection Area (beach at the west end of Crissy Field). In my experience, dog owners are very mindful of not allowing their dogs to enter the WPA, and even remind other dog owners who may inadvertently let their dogs in the WPA that dogs are not allowed during most of the year. The document needs to modify its characterization of dog presence in the WPA.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Block **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361983 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as high foot traffic (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ form other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day! In fact as I write this letter, there are 7 people wondering around the dunes!

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369186 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS assumes but does not provide the required rigorous analysis that resource conditions result solely from dog use of the sites, discounting the contribution from other visitors and recreational users. The Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS does not address the contribution of other impactful activities, including special events, to the resource conditions and existing impacts at each of the GGNRA sites.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6596 **Comment Id:** 369629 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Further, there is insufficient documentation that considers other impacts ' other park visitors that disturb and impair the natural resources, other wildlife, Mother Nature, boot camps, bicyclists, huge crowd attracting events such as Fleet Week, festivals and Walk-a-thons. The proposed broad limitations in the DEIS are without site-specific science that demonstrates that problems with the quality of GGNRA's natural resources are actually attributable to dogs and not to other factors.

Organization:

Commenter: Timothy Sinclair **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 20 **Comment Id:** 337979 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are more dogs now in San Francisco than kids, but we don't see you disallowing children on the beach - and they do alot more to disturb wildlife than the dogs do.

Organization:

Commenter: David Landis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 43 **Comment Id:** 338012 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs present no more threat to the Snowy Plover than do children, adults, and all the pollution that is allowed to be spilled on that beach. I spent two days last week at Ocean Beach, watching kids and joggers run through the crowds of snowy plovers, scattering them and making them fly- - far more than the dogs do. If the purported aim is to stop harrassing the birds, then you should start with banning children! Moreover, everyone knows that the beach is black from oil waste dumped at sea by ships before they enter the Bay and have to submit to Bay Area dumping regulations. The pollution threatens the snowy plovers every time they stick their beaks into the sand, far more than dogs chasing them!

Organization:

Commenter: Polly Shaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 50 **Comment Id:** 338021 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Furthermore, given by what I've witnessed at these parks, negative environmental impact to birds and the surrounding dunes at Fort Funston is caused just as much by kids sliding down the hills and general park visitors hiking and hanging out off-trail, as is is by dogs. I fail to see evidence that dogs are the sole cause of environmental impact.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 61 **Comment Id:** 338944 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In terms of keeping the beach clean, I find that dog owners are as responsible as the other visitors. I've found food remains, trash, dirty diapers, and other unmentionable items at the beach left by picnickers and tourists. So I think everyone could be more responsible about cleaning up after themselves and their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Menden Kibera **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 75 **Comment Id:** 338965 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: A review of the proposed plan seems vet anti-dog, blaming canines for everything from soil erosion and bringing in invasive non native species of plants to criminal activity within the GGNRA. This is not correct. I read no evaluation of the damage mountain bike riders do to paths and surrounding areas when they ride off trail. Try walking some on those trails in winter when bike tire ruts make them almost impassible due to the mud pits they create. Your own crime statistics show that crimes or offenses committed by dog owners are not the major problem within GGNRA, yet dogs seem to be the main target of Ranger scrutiny. I walk Mori Point trails daily and vandalism to signs and paths is a big problem. So is the consumption of alcohol and the broken bottles that are left by the drinkers. As for invasive plants, I believe birds and other wildlife are far more likely to be the source of these problems, feeding on plants from surrounding residential gardens. As for dogs chasing birds and wildlife, I see more children chasing birds on the beach, or poking bugs and snakes with sticks, than dogs chasing wildlife, yet there would never be a plan to ban or restrain children within the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 171 **Comment Id:** 349925 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The dog owners all police themselves, and the dogs are under voice control as a rule. We are disturbed that dogs are being singled out as a problem when I see cigarette buts, illegal fires, naked men, piles of beer cans and wine bottles. Humans seem to impose more on the beach than the dogs. It is sand...how can the dogs disturb sand?

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah A Hatch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 196 **Comment Id:** 350090 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The proposal to restrict dogs on Ocean Beach is absurd. If the concern is habitat destruction for the Snowy Plover, how can you justify allowing humans to be in these areas? Kite surfing does far more to disrupt the avian habitat. Why not shut the beach entirely for certain days?

Organization:

Commenter: Bryce Goodman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 209 **Comment Id:** 350116 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The document states: Physically restraining dogs on leash in the SPPA would reduce chasing, but even leashed dogs could bark and/or lunge at feeding and roosting western snowy plovers, causing disturbance and/or harassment in a relatively small area..... Well so could children playing with a ball, or many other "natural " occurrences are we going to ban that too?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 215 **Comment Id:** 350126 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If the reason for your plan is to preserve the land and make sure it is not being trashed, why don't you take a look at all of the pedestrians who do not have dogs. They account for a majority of the trash and waste that is left at parks or beaches.
Organization:
Commenter: John Nguyen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 230 **Comment Id:** 350153 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I see more destructive behavior from children than from dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Shirley Scofield **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 243 **Comment Id:** 350342 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In a nut shell dogs and there owners have become the scapegoat for your policy and decision making and that banning them from Ocean Beach will have little to no beneficial impact to the snowy plover or other wildlife in this habitat. It saddens me that in order to appease general opinion of the few and the misguided, I am speaking of the fact-less recommendations of institutions that I am shamefully a member of-namely the Sierra Club and Audubon Society, that dogs are incorrectly perceived as a threat to the well-being of the snowy plover. Indeed there has never been a study done to see if there is a direct impact between dogs the behavior of the snowy plover. It should be noted that as people making decisions, common sense should be used when creating laws that affect habitat. It is obvious that dogs, ranger trucks, human children, surfers, as well as little old ladies with large pocket books who hate dogs, all contribute to the stress of the snowy plover. They do not however prevent the snowy plover from inhabiting the dunes and upper beach areas of Ocean Beach. Indeed there has been little research in finding out why snowy plovers would choose to use urban areas as habitat when the majority shoreline in their range is much more pristine!
Organization: NSTA
Commenter: Fred A Andrews **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 310 **Comment Id:** 350557 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I've been around for over 60 years and I think people do more damage to the environment than animals, including dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara I Asaro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 324 **Comment Id:** 350587 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Muir Beach -On any given day 3x as many people are in the lagoon as opposed to dogs. People are also using the rocks & dunes as bathrooms. The new bathrooms are now further from the beach will enhance this problem.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 352 **Comment Id:** 350699 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I see much more damage at Fort Funston & Chrissy Field from gophers than dogs. Furthermore the damage to the cliffs is from the weather not dogs. Go out to the beaches on any fine day - Ocean Beach, Baker Beach - Chrissy Field and you will see garbage everywhere from people with children. Drink containers, candy wrappers, cigarettes and diapers everywhere. Perhaps you should ban cigarettes, food and drink from the beaches? I know I have cleaned beaches for earth day and I do not pick up garbage that dogs left - it is all from people. The dog people are the few to pick up after themselves.

Organization:

Commenter: Judith A Palmer Moran **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 360 **Comment Id:** 351145 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The focus of my comments will apply mainly to the 3 parks in San Mateo County that I frequent multiple times each week, namely: Milagra Ridge, Mori Point and Sweeney Ridge. The bulk of the habitat and environmental damage I saw at all 3 of these parks is almost entirely human-caused. Its orders-of-magnitude greater than that of dogs. In fact, its almost impossible to see any impact of dogs at all except for the rare occasional poop that a neglectful owner didnt pick up. At Milagra Ridge, most of those poops look more like they come from coyotes than from domestic dogs. I also want to be very clear that these 3 parks are all in fantastic shape. Even though the human impact is dramatically greater than that of dogs, there are only minor changes required to address them. Those changes should be focused on human causes, as I struggled to find the impact of dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Glenn Hout **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 360 **Comment Id:** 351147 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Milagra Ridge Except for the occasional dog poop that a neglectful owner hasnt picked up, I havent found any impact of dogs on this habitat. In fact, most of the poops I see across the entire Milagra Ridge site look more like they come from coyotes than from dogs. Its as if dogs have never even used this park. However, the human impact is stunning! Heres what I have cataloged: " Tagging: Someone tagged virtually every sign in Milagra Ridge during the

summer of 2013, which took the Park Service significant time (and likely associated cost) to fix. I dont think dogs were responsible. " There are a number of off-trail trails that continue to show wear where humans are going cross-country within the park, even around fenced-off and designated closed areas. However, theres not a single track to indicate that dogs are culprits. " On a few occasions, Ive seen kids riding their mountain bikes cross-country at Milagra Ridge through protected habitat and down below the batteries. Its also visible via the tire tracks, although I havent seen a single dog track in these same areas. " Finally, Milagra Ridge was used for Nike missiles from 1954 to roughly 1974, so there is likely perchlorate and other extremely toxic chemicals interlaced throughout the soil and complex near the batteries. Although no missiles were ever fired, the contamination of the area from both the missile containment areas and human staffing is likely still very present. Dogs werent responsible for any of that contamination.

Organization:

Commenter: Glenn Hout **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 360 **Comment Id:** 351148 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Mori Point However, the human impact at Mori Point is stunning. Im including a number of pictures I took during my latest walks to make these points: " Beer cans, liquor bottles, fast-food containers and general trash thrown into the ponds and streams along Polywog trail. This is the bulk of protected frog habitat and the human impact is insane. I've seen overnight camping in the woods and campfires too. One of the park rangers said they continually clean dumped trash out of the creek, including tires and even a cash register. Dogs certainly aren't the culprits. " Graffiti and destruction of various signs throughout Mon Point. Ive also included pictures of these too. Taggers have not only hit the signs, but also the bunkers and cement near the old batteries. Additionally, someone completely ripped out the sign at the intersection of the Coastal Trail and Timigtac Trail during the summer of 2013 and left it on the trail. The sign is now missing altogether. Im pretty sure that dogs arent responsible. " Automobile tires buried and half exposed all over the Timigtac ridgeline. Not sure why these are there at all. Theyre not environmentally friendly. " Non-native, invasive vegetation. The park service did a major cleanup at Mon Point in 2012 and 2013 to try and corral and destroy the invasive species impacting the local ecology. Ive included pictures of the black plastic covering a number of these hotbeds that are being used to burn up and kill the plants. These invasive species are completely human introduced and have had a stunning impact on the native ecology. Again, dogs arent responsible at all. " Cats from the neighboring subdivision regularly frequent the protected habitat areas along Polywog trail. There are at least 5 cats that Ive seen going under the fence. However, during the 8 years Ive been going to Mori Point, Ive never seen a single dog in this protected area. The existing fence keeps dogs completely out, even if the dog werent on a leash. The fence does nothing to stop the flow of cats, which are a significantly greater risk to the protected habitat than are dogs. " Off-trail hiking. I see myriad areas of Mori Point (and have witnessed countless hikers) going cross-country and forging their own trails. This is incredibly destructive to habitat and contributes to erosion. Ive never seen a single indication that dogs are responsible for any of this impact.

Organization:

Commenter: Glenn Hout **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 390 **Comment Id:** 351304 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As for the argument that dogs destroy the wilderness, well, that's complete pfooey. Humans have and always will destroy more.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 991 **Comment Id:** 351412 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Humans are a much bigger threat to the environment which you are trying to protect. They cause more physical damage to the flora and natural plantings of the GGNRA. Are you going to ban us as well?
Organization:
Commenter: David Finn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1010 **Comment Id:** 351422 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If the issue is protecting certain natural environments, humans should also be disallowed, which would be a completely different issue altogether, how to restrict mammals from disturbing the natural environment.
Organization:
Commenter: Stacy M Stock **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1075 **Comment Id:** 351530 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am writing to oppose further restrictions on dogs in the GGNRA. I believe strongly in the need to protect the areas, but I do not believe that on leash dogs cause any more harm than human encroachment has caused, and in fact, there is no comparison whatsoever. I advocate enforcing existing regulations but not further limitations on tax-paying local residents who wish to have their dogs accompany them on specified outdoor trails and other locations.
Organization:
Commenter: David Meyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1114 **Comment Id:** 351664 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: one would say that people are more destructive than any animal or wildlife so maybe people should be banned instead.let's hope not and that we can continue to enjoy the beauties of the outdoors with our pets
Organization:

Commenter: nancy yeeting **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1124 **Comment Id:** 351681 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In my opinion, humans are far more harmful to the natural environment then dogs will ever be. Do not take away some of the last places in the area where they are allowed to reconnect with their 'inner wild dog'
Organization:
Commenter: Michelle J Bell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 510 **Comment Id:** 351838 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: GGNRA DOG MANAGEMENT AT MUIR BEACH It seems that the salmon have not returned to the creek, at least not yet. I was told by a park employee that it was doubtful that the salmon would ever return because they had been gone so long and because the creek still dries up in the winter. In any case, people represent a much greater hazard to the salmon than dogs do.
Organization:
Commenter: Penelope Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 520 **Comment Id:** 351856 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: My well-trained, voice command dogs don't cause any harm to the land. People, out of control kids, park police horses cause more messes.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 522 **Comment Id:** 351860 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs are ok. Horses should be banned because the poop on the beach and nobody cleans it up.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 525 **Comment Id:** 351866 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Preserving the area? Why don't we start w/ making people pick up their trash!? The picnics in the area is what is stretching land resources, not dogs off leash.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 542 **Comment Id:** 351893 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: What else besides dogs is influencing shorebird decline. Why are picknickers/people who are noisey, disruptive and unable to manage their litter not being moved out of these areas too?
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 546 **Comment Id:** 351905 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I walk the dogs at the Rancho, at the end of Coral Reef. A larger problem are the dirt bikes that roam freely up the sides of the hill off the trials.
Organization:
Commenter: Josef T Hoog **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1186 **Comment Id:** 351935 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: No scientific data supports the proposed policy changes. The SEIS assumes dogs cause negative impact on GGNRA parks but studies have revealed the opposite is true, In contrast, GGNRA Park Police reports are replete with accounts of humans littering and vandalizing GGNRA property.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeffrey and Hoa Nebenzahl and Tran **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1264 **Comment Id:** 352194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I don't have a dog, but I just have to say, for the most part, most dog owners are responsible and watch their dogs. I don't think they should be punished for enjoying nature with their pet and not causing damage to the ecosystem. Horses are 1000lb creatures that stamp on the trail and leave massive piles of feces. I don't see any raids against horse riding any time soon.
Organization:
Commenter: Chris N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1281 **Comment Id:** 352238 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I frequent the beach and see people doing more harm to the area than dogs. We should be dealing with litter from people and harassment from the homeless first. I've never had an issue with a dog in all my years of visiting the beach and parks.
Organization:

Commenter: Seth Lael **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1310 **Comment Id:** 352282 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It seems that the decisions are not based on any scientific data and lean heavily on assumptions and assertions that provide little firm evidence that support them. It also appears to lack any peer reviewed site specific studies that I would think would be required before taking such action. Without studies and more formal review process, there do not seem to be any legitimate or legal foundations for these policy changes. Also, the plan does not differentiate between the impact caused by human beings or other animals and assumes that all negative impact is caused by dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Maile McComb **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1321 **Comment Id:** 352305 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. Without question more serious degradation is imposed on trails throughout the Bay Area by bikers every day, not to mention the egregious lack of courtesy for other users of trails and outdoor space. Could we consider putting them on leashes??
Organization:
Commenter: Christine Stuart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1368 **Comment Id:** 352404 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have seen humans on bicycles, horses and children causing far more damage and interference to the natural habitat and general enjoyment of all than I have dogs. Will you next be banning people from the sites you currently plan to exclude or severely restrict the freedom of dogs?
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1370 **Comment Id:** 352406 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I understand the concern for dog waste, but what about the huge amounts of horse or pack animal excrement that you are allowing to be left on trails? I hike and ride my bike through piles that for some reason never seem to be a concern of yours, yet dog waste is mentioned. Are we in 1860 and the horse and owner are not responsible for their own? Why should this issue be left cold. Seems everyone else that is visiting the park is held accountable for plenty of small time issues yet the largest piles just lay there for weeks on end.

Organization:
Commenter: jack Wagner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1388 **Comment Id:** 352430 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I also feel that tourists cause more damage to the environment than dogs. They walk where they aren't supposed to, litter EVERYWHERE, and generally disrespect. So if you are going to make areas NO DOG ZONES for the sake of the environment, you have to restrict human access as well, to be fair.
Organization:
Commenter: Lexi Barry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1389 **Comment Id:** 352433 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have no problem changing the snowy plover beach to no dogs allowed. I do want to note, however, that I frequently see small children racing through this area, disturbing nesting areas and frightening birds. I also see this behavior on a regular basis on all the beaches and closed off sensitive areas. Parents need to educate their children that it is not OK to harass wildlife. I see this behavior far more in children while it is extremely unusual to see dogs chasing wildlife.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathleen L Dooley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1437 **Comment Id:** 352554 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I can not tell you how many dirty diapers I have seen (and picked up) on the trails after a holiday weekend .... How many beer cans , how many cigarettes how much garbage .... So for the parks to act like thier biggest issue is dogs !
Organization:
Commenter: Teri Granados **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 579 **Comment Id:** 352669 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There has been a lot of construction in the Rodeo Beach area of the GGNRA. Huge parking lots and widened roads are far more impactful than dogs. These giant parking lots are not needed and the open space is critical to my well being and that of my dog. There is no evidence that dogs have an adverse impact on the natural area.
Organization:
Commenter: Norma D Brach **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 632 **Comment Id:** 352781 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The document fails to accurately or fully characterize the issue of potential disturbance to wildlife in the WPA. In my experience visiting Crissy Field regularly, there are many users of the WPA that disturb wildlife, including families picnicking, kids running around, kite-boarders, horses. Especially on a sunny weekend day, the WPA is often packed with people enjoying the beach. The document needs to be modified to more fully and accurately describe issues of potential wildlife disturbance at the WPA.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Block **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 645 **Comment Id:** 352804 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please do NOT make stricter restrictions on the ability to bring our dogs on our walks in this beautiful city. In my experience, people, not dogs, are the ones littering and destroying our parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1461 **Comment Id:** 352823 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On the other end, cyclists are a complete nuisance and are not respecting pedestrians zooming at all speed and not slowing down.

Organization:

Commenter: anne howard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1489 **Comment Id:** 352902 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It sounds by all the information I have read that the studies that have been done in the past have been skewed. If you look at the number of incidents with dogs (ei dog bites) it is unbelievably few as compared to crimes (violent and otherwise) by adults in these parks. Every way you look at it, adults are more dangerous to each other than dogs every have been or will be.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane M Shapiro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1520 **Comment Id:** 352981 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There's no evidence that dogs do any damage to wildlife or the environment. While a few anecdotal tales are produced about dogs attacking birds or animals, this is a vanishingly small number compared to the ordinary threats these birds and animals face from natural predators, from habitat loss due to "Native Plant Restoration" or from normal urban risks

- glass windows, moving cars, windmills.
Organization:
Commenter: Rupa Bose **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 713 **Comment Id:** 353015 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs on leash would not disturb wildlife any more than a bicyclist, a hiker, or a person on horseback.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan E Messner Whipp **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1637 **Comment Id:** 353233 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would much prefer you eliminate bikers from trails rather than dogs off leash. Bikers are far more destructive, disruptive and are quite frightening when they zip by without a word of warning! Bikers are the ones that need to be on leashes, and I am a biker! And a dog owner.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1644 **Comment Id:** 353244 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a responsible, respectful dog owner and a daily visitor to the beach I feel that dogs are one of the least detrimental elements to the native environment of ocean beach. I see more damage in the form of trash and human feces in the sand dunes on a daily basis than ever from people's pets
Organization:
Commenter: J Mitchell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 787 **Comment Id:** 353294 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I see more damage left by users who leave cigarette butts,beer cans, picnic waste, etc than anything a dog would leave behind.
Organization:
Commenter: Diannne E Turner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1653 **Comment Id:** 353470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I think you will find more trash and debris where people frequent than where dogs and dog people are found.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1683 **Comment Id:** 353583 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Most of these parks will still allow horseback riding which is far more detrimental than off leash dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Tara T **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 892 **Comment Id:** 353601 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: You seem to be hell-bent on banning dogs on the trails and beaches in and around GGRA in Marin County, but I don't see any mention of banning horses from the very same trails. Horses do far more destructive damage to the trails than dogs, with these 3,000 lb. animal's hoofs eroding the trails, not to mention the large mounds of Shit that is left behind by their owners/riders. I myself use these trails to run and hike, and I find it very annoying that I have to be subjected to stench, health hazards, and inconvenience, of the enormous quantities of horse shit.
Organization:
Commenter: Jerry N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 905 **Comment Id:** 353620 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Instead you should be restricting bikes on these paths that are so heavily used by pedestrians, runners and owners walking their dogs. The rental bicyclists - who usually ride without helmets - are the real threat.
Organization:
Commenter: Debbie Zambetti **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1699 **Comment Id:** 353656 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: People with kids who leave their pampers, people who party leaving their garbage will be able to continue to enjoy the beaches
Organization: Mrs.
Commenter: Uly Silkey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1719 **Comment Id:** 353689 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I understand the need to protect wildlife and, especially as a wildlife

rehabilitator, I understand the need to reduce threats to wildlife. But very few dogs pose threats to wildlife. Let's get real here - the biggest threat to wildlife is humans

Organization:

Commenter: Mara R Guccione **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1751 **Comment Id:** 353735 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mountain bikers are a bigger issue than dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: melissa c herst **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 938 **Comment Id:** 353798 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Kids can be just as destructive but no one bans them from public areas!!

Organization:

Commenter: Marisa P Plaice **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1787 **Comment Id:** 353857 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The dogs remaining on the trails only leave paw prints if the owners are picking up and not allowing their pets to walk on areas that are being rehabilitated. Maybe we should try fencing in the rehabilitated areas to keep people out of them instead of keeping dogs contained. Despite fencing in dogs you still have a human problem of trampling vegetation.

Organization:

Commenter: Michele Batista **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5035 **Comment Id:** 353891 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Since I am out on the trails so often I see the impact of horses, bikes, running events, hikers, too. Everyone needs to share the land and share the responsibility of taking care of this beautiful land.

Organization:

Commenter: Polly Ing **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5042 **Comment Id:** 353901 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Since I am out on the trails so often I see the impact of horses, bikes, running events, hikers, too.

Organization: none

Commenter: Alex Ether **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1807 **Comment Id:** 354116 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dog restrictions proposed in the Draft Dog Management Plan for the GGNRA are far too exclusive of dogs where they have long traditionally been allowed. I believe restrictions are necessary in sensitive areas where wildlife can be disrupted by dog and human activity, but this plan excludes dog activity where it causes no environmental disruption or damage. Indeed, far more destructive human activity is permitted in many areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen A Waxman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1833 **Comment Id:** 354293 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: What I've experienced on the beaches, on the other hand, is the litter left behind by people, not dogs. If litter were the criterion used to restrict beach use, we would ban people from the beaches. Enforce liter laws.
Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 1836 **Comment Id:** 354313 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Not once have I seen a mishap created by a dog, nor have I noticed the dogs seriously destroying the habitat. In fact, over the years having surfed at Ocean Beach, I have see the coastline and dunes drastically change as result of storms or high surf.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen Nichols **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1844 **Comment Id:** 354338 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Bicyclists and uncontrolled young children are a far worse safety risk in the GGNRA than dogs - particularly at Crissy Field. Bicyclists and unsupervised children routinely run uncomfortably close to pedestrians, cause collisions and ignore basic courtesy. If the GGNRA wants to increase safety at Crissy Field, it should: (1) either ban bicycles or begin strict ticketing of bicyclists who ride too fast and too close to pedestrians.
Organization:
Commenter: David Collins **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1844 **Comment Id:** 354340 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Moreover, the Audubon Society grossly distorts this discussion by claiming [as their representative did on January 30 in San Francisco at Stern Grove] that dogs are to blame for the reduction in numbers of certain birds. No empirical data supports that false claim - the Audubon representative couldn't cite any when asked to do so on January 30. Feral cats, coyotes and other natural predators ignored by this plan are more of a risk to birds than dogs. And they all have been such a risk since time immemorial and before there ever was a national park system.

Organization:

Commenter: David Collins **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1879 **Comment Id:** 354424 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I find that most owners are very responsible and that the impact dogs have his less than the impact some hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders have on the same ares.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth D Joyce **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1891 **Comment Id:** 354465 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please ban all dogs and cats from national and state parks. They are destroying the ecosystem and disturbing the wildlife

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1914 **Comment Id:** 354535 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: From what I understand, the GGNRA's purpose is (or should be) to maintain urban recreational areas for Bay Area residents, and while, as an avid outdoorsperson, I am certainly concerned for the preservation of my natural surroundings, I am not at all convinced that my dog could cause a more detrimental environmental impact than humans.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicole M Turnipseed **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1919 **Comment Id:** 354553 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Reducing dog use will not keep it safe from human-caused erosion, litter, air/water/noise pollution. The notion that dog use is the thing that imperils this land for future generations is absurd. Aren't there horse trails (in general - why doesn't the NPS get around to keeping horses away - as a backpacker I hate horses)?

Organization:

Commenter: David V Gainer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1965 **Comment Id:** 354626 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: while I'm sure dogs may have a negative impact on the area I also imagine that if the habitat were particularly vulnerable that people, horses, and bikes wouldn't be allowed on it. Likewise, the "integrity" mentioned is not some sort of wilderness area - but one crisscrossed by roads, people, horses, and bikes and a campsite.
Organization:
Commenter: David Gainer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2661 **Comment Id:** 354833 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs have no greater impact on the environment than, for instance, a child would, and certainly less impact than a bicycle would.
Organization:
Commenter: Sherron L Bullens **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2996 **Comment Id:** 355335 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I have a dog who loves to run around in these areas. He isn't doing any harm to the environment, he is more part of nature than we humans are, I can't tell you how much trash and human body waste I see in these areas. Humans are ruining the environment not dogs!
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Ashley Leifer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2071 **Comment Id:** 355639 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If the Environmental groups are super concerned about the parks then they need to be closed to not only dogs but people as well. People/tourists are far worse than the local dogs that go to an off leash dog park, so why not cut tourism then? Oh wait! That would be bad for the economy and the City of San Francisco's revenue. What about the construction that is happening in/near/over the Presidio area? It is driving more of the wild animals to the City center and out of their homes. The Presidio police like to inform local and general public that the dog owners and their faithful companions, are the cause of the birds moving to other areas, coyotes dying and the other furry creatures becoming more of a risk of going extinct. By all means, blame them, but next time you visit the beautiful Presidio National Park take a good look around and see how much construction is going on ALL around the park that is so well preserved for millions of tourists to visit on foot, bike and car. Off leash dogs are not the problem.
Organization:

Commenter: Janell A Hughes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2081 **Comment Id:** 355671 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Banning dogs is an easy move. What would be difficult would be studying to find the actually dangers of these endangered species (people, pollution, ect..) and working to minimize those impacts. If we are going to ban dogs from an urban park, why not ban cars too? I would bet the cars do far more damage in a year that the dogs would do in a lifetime.
Organization:
Commenter: William B Diefenbach **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2159 **Comment Id:** 355840 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: While there are a few "bad apple" dog owners who may not follow park rules, there are others - such as teenagers leaving empty beer bottles on the beach - who also violate the rules. Should we banish them?
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Z Chuday **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4464 **Comment Id:** 356000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: From an environmental impact standpoint, dogs are FAR less damaging to the environment than people. If there is a particularly sensitive habitat that exists in these recreation areas, they should be closed to public use entirely and redesigned as wildlife preserves. A dog in the com pany of a responsible owner will stay on walking paths, refrain from disturbing wildlife, and make the overall park experience more enjoyable for everyone who might potentially enjoy the connection with nature that an outdoor recreation area is supposed to foster. Conversely, humans leave behind garbage (particularly cigarette buts,) trample pants, and, at times, create a tremendous intrusion into the lives of wild animals. The ecological impact of humans is far more detrimental than the impact of dogs. Thus, if an area to sensitive to intrusion, it should not be open to any foreign intrusion.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Scott Peterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2179 **Comment Id:** 356617 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Nevertheless it is people that are the most disruptive of the environment, without question, and you can't (or aren't) getting rid of them. You might as well let the dogs have some fun by providing adequate play areas. With people tramping through and dumping their trash and butts anyway, there's nothing very natural about these parks now, is there?
Organization:

Commenter: Fred L Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2236 **Comment Id:** 356851 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There is far more adverse interaction with the park lands from bus loads of dog less people that defend on our communities every weekend than there is from those few that come out here and hike with their dogs to enjoy our regional parklands be they National or otherwise.
Organization:
Commenter: Amelia L Neffati **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2604 **Comment Id:** 356860 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are not the problem!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Littering young adults in Dolores Park is the local problem! Partiers on the hill leaving their trash behind. Don't criminalize free dog runs!!!!! Get more trash cans in that park!!!!! Have police awareness and non-littering awareness Patrols!
Organization:
Commenter: Don R Ross **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2673 **Comment Id:** 357030 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dogs do less damage than people and the weather.
Organization:
Commenter: Margaret Best **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2801 **Comment Id:** 357509 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My kids chase the birds more than my dogs but that doesn't mean I should leash my kids.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2809 **Comment Id:** 357530 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Humans, on the other hand, who come for recreation, make a huge amount of trash, which is left not only in the trash bins, but all over the beach. I find bottles, toys, pieces of broken things, along with an array of food packaging. They start fires, let their kids run and scream, chasing birds and climbing all over the cliffs, and after all that, leave garbage on the beach.

Organization:
Commenter: Melissa J Flower **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357576 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they werent supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2854 **Comment Id:** 357653 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have heard concern about wildlife protection in connection with the parks. Every week I see children climbing up the dunes and eroding the sandy cliff face at Ft. Funston. Organized "boot camp" excersize groups climb the dunes and tear up the turf. If off leash dogs are banned in the name of wildlife and environmental damage, then off leash children and fitness groups should also be banned.
Organization:
Commenter: Jack A Hannan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2304 **Comment Id:** 357697 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I feel that a mob of drunken men playing frisbee on the beach will cause far more disturbance to the endangered bird nesting areas than does a well behaved dog walking calmly with his owner.
Organization:
Commenter: Wallace Marshall **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2874 **Comment Id:** 357706 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: People do much more damage and leave much more trash (i.e. resource degradation) in the parks than dogs ever will, so to restrict the use of dog owners in these areas will only make a small difference when compared to the overall problem.
Organization:

Commenter: Dale Maffett **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2347 **Comment Id:** 357843 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The Pedro Point Highlands have been negatively affected by decades of motorcycle and other high impact uses. Why are dogs being restricted?
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3063 **Comment Id:** 357860 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: You know it's funny - I actually truly fear bicycle riders more than I fear dogs, even those owned by inattentive owners. I nearly get beamed by people breaking traffic laws on their bicycles on a weekly basis. How about a complete ban on bikes? That sounds hugely reasonable to me, based on your line of thinking.
Organization:
Commenter: Melissa Mecca **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3179 **Comment Id:** 357954 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you ban dogs, you have to ban people. They are the ones leaving broken glass, beer cans, cigarette buds ect.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3378 **Comment Id:** 358292 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs do not damage the environment, people do including your own Park Service.
Organization:
Commenter: pam herz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3383 **Comment Id:** 358296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Us humans harm the environment way more than dogs. If you think that dogs would harm the birds, they won't, because last time I checked, birds can fly. I have never seen a dog catch a bird, so I don't think thats the problem.
Organization:
Commenter: Jackson N Fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3386 **Comment Id:** 358303 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Certainly, people leave behind a lot more trash and do a lot more damage than dogs do

Organization:

Commenter: Wendy J Wald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2389 **Comment Id:** 358884 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As an aside, from what I can see from personal observations, there is a far greater impact from humans. Why not restrict humans too from these lands. The numbers of dog related citations is less than 0.1% o all dog related visits according to the GGNRA's own statistics. Human citations outnumber these.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert I Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2414 **Comment Id:** 358914 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I'm sorry this is just ridiculous. I love how it's all the dogs fault for the destruction of the environment and chasing the birds away. I swear when I go to Ocean Beach or Crissy Field I see trash left by humans, children that are running around unsupervised chasing birds and people just walking on plant life where they shouldn't be. It's 1% o the land that should be left alone for dogs to run free and enjoy the freedom of the outdoors. Also if your going to start going after the dogs for being so destructive and chasing away wildlife why doesn't any of this include the horses that are riding down the hillside or running along the beach at Ft. Funston. I've seen your precious birds using all their valuable energy running away from the horses and even people that are running or walking along the waters edge.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2416 **Comment Id:** 358915 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It's getting nearly impossible to find a beach that allows dogs, let alone any that allow off-Leash. Some say it's about protecting the Snowy Plover, which is a novel idea and one I support...but then there they all are with their little kids, tromping through the dunes, playing football and laying out their picnics and chairs, umbrellas and leaving behind trash. The hypocrisy is HUGE!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2428 **Comment Id:** 358927 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This is not a pristine area. The impact of dog access is insignificant compared past uses by the military.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith J Swett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2529 **Comment Id:** 359029 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This DEIS could just replace "dog" with "human" and the arguments would be virtually the same except "humans" have a greater adverse impact because of the larger visitation counts. Believe it or not, humans are natural born predators, and the GGNRA law enforcement data proves humans have been known to attack each other, go off-trail into closed areas, and disturb wildlife. Plus, humans, like dogs, have been known to make noise, litter, dig in the sand, splatter sand, bump into other people, walk around the batteries, trample hiking trail beds, produce garbage, find and report injured wildlife, pee on the bushes, injure themselves while exercising, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: Heather t Prahl **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3432 **Comment Id:** 359213 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My view is that federal officials managing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area should take a balanced approach to various human uses in the park. This certainly means protecting certain critical areas where endangered bird species are known to breed. For example fencing off the beach along Crissy Field where the Snowy Plovers nest to protect these birds from off-leash dogs is good park management. However it would naive to believe that keeping dogs out will allow the Plovers to thrive. Predation from natural predators like raccoons and certain raptors as well as climatic factors may destroy this habitat for Plovers despite our best efforts. It's still the right thing to do.

Organization:

Commenter: Creig P Flessel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3724 **Comment Id:** 359412 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you are worried about damage to the endangered birds perhapl you should get rid of all the crows and ravens that eat there eggs.

Organization:

Commenter: Ingo Orlamunder **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3745 **Comment Id:** 359444 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are far less invasive and destructive than people, horses and mountain bikers.

Organization:

Commenter: Mark Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3788 **Comment Id:** 359802 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: While I understand the GGNRA's concerns about wildlife, in order to truly protect wildlife in an urban area, you would have to greatly restrict people, in addition to dogs, which none of the alternatives proposes to do. Ocean Beach is very much an urban beach. It is used by all kinds of people for all kinds of reasons.

Organization:

Commenter: Maeve F Clancy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3973 **Comment Id:** 360315 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I witness more impact from human users of Ft. Funston: small children chasing birds and littering or "boot camp" participants destroying native vegetation as they run through the park. However I realize that leashing restrictions on children and joggers are not the answer but rather improved communication and enforcement of GGNRA rules.

Organization:

Commenter: Douglas V Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4041 **Comment Id:** 360318 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We love Crissy Field. Sam our yellow lab is at his best when he is there. We went today on Valentines day and got to walk, throw the ball and connect with nature. It is so important to have nature avaliable to all, including dogs, in the heart of the city. It erased the boringness of a long work week. I go back feeling like I have had a trip to the mountains or been. My connection to nature is what keeps me healthy and also Sam our yellow lab. As a retired couple Sam is our constant companion and to be able to go to Crissy Field is the best. I go home feeling like I have been to th mountaina on a long vacation. Please do not close it off. The bikes cause more troubles then the dogs. Please do not take away our wonderful closeness to nature, our ability to find pleasure without a long drive. If you are reading this inside, go out and look around anad when you go back inside see if you don't feel better, Or pet a dog and you will feel better.

Organization:

Commenter: elaine anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3975 **Comment Id:** 360324 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I've heard the excuses that it hurts the wildlife and that people complain about the dog's poop and behavior but WE HUMANS have done more to hurt the environment than any other animal in this world.

Organization:

Commenter: Louis Riviere **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4507 **Comment Id:** 360451 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Humans do far more damage, cause more trouble and devastate our parks mor than any four leg creature!!

Organization:

Commenter: D Gordon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4584 **Comment Id:** 360988 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I cannot tell you the number of children I have seen running on the dunes in protected areas where the snowy plover live, families picnicking and playing football right in front of "protected wilderness area" signs, wind surfers displacing people walking on the beach (with and without dogs), trash being thrown around and not in the cans, etc.... Your analysis has a very narrow lens and appears to be highly biased.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Carboy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4594 **Comment Id:** 361100 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When I visit I frequently see families running on the dunes in protected areas where the snowy plover live, picnicking and playing in areas protected as wilderness areas. You would be well served to increase enforcement among the non-dog walking population.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4594 **Comment Id:** 361102 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I note the negative impact of businesses in the Presidio and the traffic and noise that they bring, the large charitable events that are held at Crissy Field, and special events such as the Americas Cup. There seems to be no mention of this in your report or any efforts to curtail these activities.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4638 **Comment Id:** 361156 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I was throughout trails in San Mateo and see first-hand that human garbage (wrappers, broken glass) if far more prevalent than dog waste.
Organization:
Commenter: craig a fanning **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4708 **Comment Id:** 361364 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: what fun is the nature gonna be filled with flocks of matching speedo bikers trying to run you over and loud watteling famlies that allow their ignorant children to chase the wild life?
Organization:
Commenter: whitney b leslie **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4787 **Comment Id:** 361529 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a regular visitor to the area, it is also evident that unruly children are a more common annoyance than are off leash dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4824 **Comment Id:** 361600 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Should dog owners be fined when their pets chase birds - absolutely! But people are the big culprits when it comes to creating damage. I live across from Ocean Beach and am constantly picking up garbage and hearing illegal fireworks being set off, not to mention watching people themselves chasing birds.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4834 **Comment Id:** 361614 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And don't lose sight of the fact that people threaten far more species than than dogs ever will!
Organization:
Commenter: Andrew J Leahy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4846 **Comment Id:** 361626 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Perhaps the City of San Francisco should be focusing on their resident humans, not dogs as I do not think the same can be said for them. Why punish the ones who are behaving?

Organization:

Commenter: Diane L Wales **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4875 **Comment Id:** 361682 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If ecological or environmental impact is a concern, note that Funston's commercial horseback-riding operations routinely deposit large piles of horse feces on the beach, whereas dog feces is rarely seen

Organization:

Commenter: Jeremy G **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4883 **Comment Id:** 361699 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: All uses of Crissy Field present potential undesirable consequences: bicycles collide with pedestrians and other bikes, picnics create litter and packaging endangers wildlife, auto access generates air pollution and pedestrian and cycling hazards, surfers and sail boarders create risks to self and others, yet these activities are encouraged because they serve the GGNRA's recreational mandate and enhance the diversity of visitors to the site. Off-leash dog walking is indistinguishable from these other uses.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard Springwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4975 **Comment Id:** 361877 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The bulk of the resource degradation that I see as a restoration worker with Presidio Park Stewards is caused by HUMANS, not by dogs. The best way to protect our park resources is to have the people using the park invested in taking care of it and understanding, in their heart, its value.

Organization: Sierra Club

Commenter: Annemarie A Donjacour **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4982 **Comment Id:** 361889 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is also insufficient documentation that considers other impacts to the environment, such as: other wildlife, cyclists, joggers, boaters, kite surfers, exercise boot camps, visitors, and large crowd events like races and walk-a-thons. I recently picked up a syringe from the shoreline and disposed of it. After a holiday weekend or a warm weekend, the beaches are littered with food wrappers, glass bottles, plastic children's toys, clothing and other items.

Organization:
Commenter: Carol Selsted **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361915 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The impact I see on the environment from humans themselves is far more damaging than a few dogs running off leash. Humans bring all kinds of trash and leave it in the beach. They bring furniture, burn it and leave the remains on the beach. Fisherman's sharp lures are buried in the sand or seaweed leaving potential dangers, fishing line is wrapped around birds legs and they do nothing to set the bird free.
Organization:
Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5003 **Comment Id:** 361924 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs, whether on or off leash, have no more adverse affect on the environment than the humans that own them, or, humans without dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Agneta K Dupen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361986 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dune fences have been installed and block access to the dunes and wetland area for dogs, unless the dog enters the creek to cross to the county beach on the other side (as the SEIS directs dog owners to do (page 114) , or an owner is in the area with their dog. On most days, I watch from my living room window as people without dogs disregard the fence and signage and enter the areas behind the fence anyway.
Organization:
Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361990 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I watch each day as people traipse through the newly restored and fenced delicate dune and riparian areas. Children play in the lagoon and creek. Bonfires burn after hours. People camp in the dunes. Litter is strewn across the beach and left at the bridge entrance on the beach. I carry home an armful of trash each morning when I walk the dog. Where is the park maintenance staff to clean up the litter every day? The dispenser by the footbridge should have signage notifying owners and be filled with plastic bags, and in addition a disposal bin could be placed for pet waste.
Organization:
Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5020 **Comment Id:** 362021 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As for the native habitat existing around the parking lots and trails, humans are causing more destruction than dogs as I continually see humans tramping and urinating on habitat. I see nothing in the proposed plan regarding enforcement of errant human activity which is the root of these problems.
Organization:
Commenter: Genevieve Coyle **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4119 **Comment Id:** 362046 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As a resident who lives near Fort Mason area, I often see on a nice weekend oodles of young people who are trashing the park, leaving behind waste, trash, bottles, broken ones on their way out of the park, and I think to myself, "how is it that dogs do more damage to these beautiful parks than humans are doing?" Sometimes I come across more homeless feces, throw up, and needles, in the local park than any dog waste. Basically I see more damage done by humans than by any amount of dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Brian Muirhead **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4138 **Comment Id:** 362066 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The real impact to the environment of the GGNRA is from humans who do not pick up their trash. I have personally picked up huge amounts of food wrappers, plastic beach toys, cigarette butts, and other human trash.
Organization:
Commenter: Jonathan M Maguire **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4156 **Comment Id:** 362084 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: From an environmental impact standpoint, dogs are FAR less damaging to the environment than people. If there is a particularly sensitive habitat that exists in these recreation areas, they should be closed to public use entirely and redesigned as wildlife preserves. A dog in the company of a responsible owner will stay on walking paths, refrain from disturbing wildlife, and make the overall park experience more enjoyable for everyone who might potentially enjoy the connection with nature that an outdoor recreation area is supposed to foster. Conversely, humans leave behind garbage (particularly cigarette buts,) trample pants, and, at times, create a tremendous intrusion into the lives of wild animals. The ecological impact of humans is far more detrimental than the impact of dogs. Thus, if an area to sensitive to intrusion, it should not be open to any foreign intrusion.

Organization:
Commenter: Scott Peterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5021 **Comment Id:** 362132 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as high foot traffic (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ form other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne Rowe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5095 **Comment Id:** 362172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you are concerend about the environmental impacts, limit the PEOPLE, dogs are a small portion of this issue, and I can't understand why you would regulate dogs further without regulating people.
Organization:
Commenter: Rusty N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5138 **Comment Id:** 362271 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I walk on the Miwok Trail several times a week. The impacts of horses on the trail is significant and awful and I find it rediculous that you can ban off leash dog walking based on dog poop when the piles of horse manure on the trails are offensive and massive.
Organization:
Commenter: Kate Gruen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5176 **Comment Id:** 362442 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm a frequently user of Crissy Fields and Fort Funston. Current maintence is poor. The Crissy Fields protected area for the Snowy Plovers is sand with dried and or dead plants. Why is there a need to restrict off leash while current maintence falters? Your report stated the snowy plovers have decreased due to mercury. That is an ocean problem, not dog. The walkways at Fort Funston have cracks, crumbling, and collective sand dunes .
Organization:
Commenter: Shirley Wing **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5179 **Comment Id:** 362456 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Why don't we enforce that all of our tourists that barely know how to ride a bike, ride the bike on the bike path along Crissy Field and the road and not on the sandy walking path where children and walkers, runners and dogs interact. Why don't we also focus on the tourists that have no idea how to ride a bike over the Golden Gate bridge and put everyone in danger by not riding single file, lying down bikes in the middle of the path and basically not skilled bikers, or what about focusing on all the traffic caused by tourists lining up in cars and backing up the GG bridge to park in the very limited parking on the Marin side of the bridge. Why don't we focus on what is really broken in our public land which is the extreme congestion and abuse caused by tourists

Organization:

Commenter: Charlotte Shropshire **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5190 **Comment Id:** 362548 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash dog walking is a positive and does not interfere with other people's use or enjoyment of the park, especially when compared to the never ending foot races held in the park, bicycle riders and picnickers who leave trash in the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian Kerester **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5198 **Comment Id:** 362579 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Children can be destructive too? Why not make leash laws for children as well

Organization:

Commenter: Ryan P Witwicki Faddegon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5202 **Comment Id:** 362593 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is hard to imagine, even after reading the SEIS, how dogs could be significantly problematic for wildlife over and above the impact of the human impact in these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Johannes Rothlind **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362661 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The alleged impacts to Muir Beach that the SEIS say "could" be caused by dogs are NOT. I live and work right over the beach. I see the real offenders EVERY SINGLE DAY, and they aren't dogs. I see people jumping over the new fence, without dogs. I see people

walking around the fence and up the creek leading their children in to the bushes to relieve themselves because the parking lot bathrooms seem too far away. Both these things I witnessed today, and many other days. I've found dirty diapers in the sand. And dirty underwear. My friend's 3 year old son got 3rd degree burns on the soles of his feet because he accidentally stepped on a partially buried smoldering fire that some humans decided to have outside of the established fire rings. My neighbors and I pick up trash on our daily walks across the beach. It's amazing what beach goers leave behind! I've watched kids kick and stab starfish and smash tide pools with rocks. I've watched kids climb up eroding hillsides and kick the dirt with their feet to INTENTIONALLY further erode the hill for fun. I've seen entire cases of beer bottles left on the beach. I've had a fisherman's hook go in to my clothing on an errant cast. I've gotten snagged in the invisible fishing lines that drag across the surf at the water's edge. I've cut my feet on broken glass because I had the audacity to take my shoes off at the beach! I've seen entire Webber bbq's abandoned in the sand! And then there's the lagoon.....I've seen a lot with the lagoon. I grew up swimming in the lagoon as a toddler. The water was warm and shallow and "safe". It's where we who grew up in or near Muir Beach played. And today (even post restoration) is no different. I see parents pushing their kids on boogie boards. I see parents wading and walking up the lagoon in to the wetland with children because it's a fun adventure. I've seen, and just witnessed yesterday, an entire family trying to shortcut back to the parking lot by crossing over the newly restored wetland. NONE of these things involved dogs. NOT A SINGLE ONE.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5262 **Comment Id:** 362831 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On the other hand, few dogs have caused any significant problems on the trails, people not dogs are the issue here.

Organization:

Commenter: Colleen Lenihan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5268 **Comment Id:** 362839 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The 'research' the GGNRA has gathered erroneously implies that removing dogs from these areas will remove the threat to fragile restored wildlife populations. Unless the GGNRA plans to also ban children, adults, hang-gliders, hawks and radio-controlled planes, then this line of though is seriously flawed.

Organization:

Commenter: Caroleen Beatty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362860 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not discuss the impacts occurring to the plover from the marked increase in raven populations, which predate on plover, at Ocean Beach. Ravens, a much larger

bird that forage and scavenge closer to the surf, are more likely to be chased by dogs. The SEIS should document the indirect impact on plover predation by ravens and other predators if dogs are banned. Additionally, provide the scientific support that disturbance during the nonbreeding season is affecting breeding behavior. There is much unsupported conclusory statements in the SEIS regarding the impacts to the plover.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5295 **Comment Id:** 362914 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Following this path of logic means that: >We should ban children from the vast majority of the GGNRA, because a few children chase wildlife, run excitedly through and damage sensitive habitat, scream at the top of their lungs and throw rocks at birds, or rip branches from trees to use as play swords, or hiking poles. >We should ban mountain bikers from the vast majority of the GGNRA because some of them erode trails and damage hillsides and wildlife habitat, aggressively confront hikers and horseback riders on single-track trails where they are not allowed, and build illegal and destructive hidden trails for their personal sport. >There are smokers tossing cigarette butts, litterbugs tossing trash, pot farmers using pesticides and polluting creeks, and parents leaving detritus behind from family beach picnics. Does it thus follow that we ban all humans from the vast majority of the GGNRA?

Organization:

Commenter: Alice G Long **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4337 **Comment Id:** 363788 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I regularly walk with my dog on the Oakwood and Camino Alto ridge trails. We would like to enjoy the multitude of other beautiful trails available as well, but they are off limits to dogs. These are some of the only trails left that allow my dog. I don't really understand the limiting of dogs on trails. I think dogs are more gentle on trails than humans. Dogs don't build illegal trails to zoom along on their bikes. Dogs don't start forest fires by throwing out lit cigarettes or not putting out their campfires. They also don't leave trash and other garbage behind. The only thing they do leave behind (if their human doesn't pick it up) is completely biodegradable.A few dogs are misbehaved but most are well behaved and under voice or leash control. Dogs are just happy to be outside and they get their humans outside too which is healthy for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: Joyce V Porter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5511 **Comment Id:** 363888 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: we could include how mounted horse cops are permitted to run their thousand pound horses in these areas.

Organization: SuperDog City, LLC
Commenter: Corey M Vitale **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5520 **Comment Id:** 363895 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There have been no site specific studies done that support restrictions. WHY ARE THE PEOPLE WITH DOGS being targeted. What about the mountain bikes & horses I see them in areas they aren't suppose to be and your not kicking them off the mountain. We (Hiker with dogs) do a lot less damage with our feet then they do
Organization:
Commenter: Shelley Losch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5523 **Comment Id:** 363899 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I can understand the opposing views fear of danger however these are public areas that should be free for residents and their dogs to enjoy. It is no more dangerous than skateboarders or bikers and accidents may happen in any form however I believe it is wrong to take away the freedom of our Shared public areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Leila Sarikey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5528 **Comment Id:** 363903 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The fact is, too, that the damage and destruction that people do- -compared to dogs- -is infinitely greater, yet the option of banning people from certain areas doesn't appear to be on the table
Organization:
Commenter: Rachel N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5542 **Comment Id:** 363918 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: All dogs I encounter on the beach are well behaved and controlled by their owners. I have not encountered any instances of dogs harassing either wild life or other people. If anything, human impact from littering and walking on the dunes has a far greater negative impact on the beach wildlife than dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Chad R Plummer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5563 **Comment Id:** 363952 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I live 2 blocks from the beach in San Francisco and witness the horrors that HUMANS (not dogs) inflict on nature and our beautiful land daily. This includes garbage and oil on the beach, among other atrocities.

Organization:

Commenter: Meredith Preble **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5585 **Comment Id:** 363969 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan addresses dog presence in the GGNRA as if it were destroying the ecosystem in these areas. The ecosystem in urban areas is already altered by people, hang gliders and horses who also frequent these areas. To target dogs as a major factor in altering the ecosystem is unfair and shortsighted.

Organization:

Commenter: Pat Veitch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5588 **Comment Id:** 363973 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have been nothing but impressed with the way people interact with others. I've run into more inconsiderate people flying kites than I have dog owners in the GGNRA. In fact, there were fewer than 20 reported incidents involving dogs in the most recent data released.

Organization:

Commenter: Colleen A McNulty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5589 **Comment Id:** 363975 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have not noticed dogs going into the fenced off areas where seeding and native plants are being grown. The dogs stay with their people and other dogs. I have much more often seen children playing in those areas picking flowers and plants. So it might be more effective to ban children. I don't see how you can justify not allowing dogs at Chrissy field, they are much less likely to impact anything than the wind and kite surfers who occasionally take over the whole beach. Yet there is no talk of banning them.

Organization:

Commenter: Ted Helminski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5636 **Comment Id:** 364055 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: After living in the area for 50 Years, I have personally seen way more damage and disrespect to the land and wildlife from humans then from the small amount of dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Aran T Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5660 **Comment Id:** 364090 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please stop making off-leash dogs the problem - there are many more problmes, like vandalism, people who trash our beaches for the 4th of July, etc. Honor your promises in the past to keep off-leash areas available. There are many dog owners in San Francisco and Beyond who need areas to walk our dogs of leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Joanna L Van Elk **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5740 **Comment Id:** 364208 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I will use ocean beach as the primary example here, there is more garbage along the north end of ocean beach than should be acceptable, I surf there many mornings, and the state the beach, a national recreation area, is horrid, this also applies at Crissy Field and Baker beach Personally, I am disgusted that the GGNRA would even consider hiring rangers to police dog activity and not focus 100% o preserving these areas. The second issue for me is the squatting. Ironically located next to a sign restricting off leash dog walking at the Dunes in front of Judah, you can find on any given day up to 10 squatters polluting in many ways and making it unsafe for people like me who frequent the beach in the mornings.
Organization:
Commenter: Alex M Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5763 **Comment Id:** 364262 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Personally I am more concerned with drunk/stoned Marina girls and frat boys behaving badly in these open areas, as well as the people who discard their childrens' soiled diapers into planting area than from any behaviors from the dogs I have seen.
Organization:
Commenter: Kevin Ivanovic **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5796 **Comment Id:** 364317 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I must admit that people are much more destructive and disrespectful of the environment. I picked up quite alot of garbage on Stinson beach yesterday and the dogs were all well behaved.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara J DeGaetano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5826 **Comment Id:** 364365 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The main 'argument' of the GGNRA seems to be that 'dogs make birds fly away'. This happens when runners pass birds. This happens when children approach birds. This happens when NPS employees drive past on ATVs. It would be helpful to see ANY numbers that indicate that bird populations have been affected by these dogs- but, after spending 3/4 million USD on the proposal, GGNRA has not been able to provide any compelling evidence against dogs. This proposal is pushed by data from the GGNRA that does not in any way support the proposal.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5838 **Comment Id:** 364383 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Instead of targeting dogs and their parents (owners), target the children and their parents (owners)! They don't clean up after themselves nor do they respect the boundaries set to protect native plants. Garbage in the plants and/or the ocean/bay are directly attributed to their disregard for the environment. Target the smokers who dump their cigarette butts all over the place! Butts are not environmentally friendly by any means! Target the tourists who have no understanding of the history of each park under GGNRA. In their stupidity, they trample all over native plants. Target the cyclists who speed or barrel down the paths harming the plants on the paths.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan M Gonzalez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5941 **Comment Id:** 364758 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Any instances of dogs harming birds are very rare and unusual, this can be addressed by proper dog training. As for disturbing the nesting sights this can be addressed through education and signage. The FERREL CATS are the problem here, please spend your time and MY money on addressing this much more significant problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Vivien MacDonald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364789 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The vast majority of erosion on the Rancho and Montara mountain is caused by mountain bikes going off-trail. That is patently obvious to anyone who hikes these hills. Also, my personal safety has been threatened numerous times by speeding mountain bikers, but never by a dog. In a recent event, a mountain biker came down a ridge at about 50 mph - and fortunately yelled in time for me to jump out of the way.

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364790 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Horses: The major source of excrement on these trails is from horses, not dogs. Dog owners seem to clean up regularly, but I've never seen a horse rider do so. Note that dogs, but not horses, are native species in this area. Horse tracks also cause far more disruption of vegetation than dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364791 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Cars and motorcycles: Both types of vehicles have climbed to the top of the eucalyptus ridge southwest of Montara Mtn. Extensive tire-based erosion is visible in the wooded gullies east of this ridge. Motorcycles occasionally continue down the ridge to the old San Pedro road.

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6005 **Comment Id:** 364884 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If we are restricting dog access, we should also restrict access to children who can run rampant trampling plants and screaming and squealing. We should restrict smokers and horses and mountain bikes, and the list goes on.

Organization:

Commenter: sarah jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4413 **Comment Id:** 365158 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Watch humans in GGNRA open space. they startle the snowy plover, leave trash,ride their bikes too fast in crowds,and leave a more lasting "footprint" not paw print.

Organization:

Commenter: nancy wright **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4432 **Comment Id:** 365226 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If you are going to discriminate against any group of tax payers/residents/visitors, please be egalitarian about it...disabled people in motorized vehicles can damage natural areas, as well as people using canes who stick them into plants or environments that can be damaged. And what about young children who energetically run after each other and trample on plants, or big brother pushing little sister in the stroller all over the natural environment while the mother looks on and laughs....or talks/texts on her phone?

Organization:
Commenter: andrew and nanci scoular **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6047 **Comment Id:** 365246 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is my strong belief that making nature off-limits is not the answer to environmental issues. Rather, educating the public about the importance of preserving the environment and teaching them methods to achieve this should be the goal. Irresponsible people without dogs cause damage, not responsible people with dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6054 **Comment Id:** 365258 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are not a worthy subject of review. The percentage of what problems they cause through out the years are fractional compared to other important topics such as: money saving, safety issues, environmental impacts, inner city youth exclusion, corrupt contractors and NPS officials not hold accountable for the duties they are responsible to perform for the GGNRA.
Organization: Private Citizen/CrissyFieldDogGroup
Commenter: Debra A Bagnulo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4459 **Comment Id:** 365345 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: We should ban children from the vast majority of the GGNRA, because a few children chase wildlife, run excitedly through and damage sensitive habitat, scream at the top of their lungs and throw rocks at birds, or rip branches from trees to use as play swords, or hiking poles. >We should ban mountain bikers from the vast majority of the GGNRA because some of them erode trails and damage hillsides and wildlife habitat, aggressively confront hikers and horseback riders on single-track trails where they are not allowed, and build illegal and destructive hidden trails for their personal sport. >There are smokers tossing cigarette butts, litterbugs tossing trash, pot farmers using pesticides and polluting creeks, and parents leaving detritus behind from family beach picnics. Does it thus follow that we ban all humans from the vast majority of the GGNRA
Organization:
Commenter: Anni Long **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4470 **Comment Id:** 365357 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There are so few places already for hiking with dogs in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, parts of the Marin Headlands, and Krissy Field are wonderful

places for furry friends to run around and experience the outdoors. Closing these off would deprive owners and dogs alike of this joy. San Francisco is a crowded city, and residents do not have space on their property, and the parks are too small for dogs to get proper excercise. Teenagers partying do far more damage to our open space than dogs do.

Organization:

Commenter: Katie A DeFea **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365361 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA's preferred alternate will prevent me from recreating for my own health in the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 20 years - for which I have caused, I might add, no more adverse affect on these properties or the local environment than have my fellow hikers, joggers, bicyclists, hang gliders or windsurfers who use the same beaches and trails.

Organization:

Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6113 **Comment Id:** 365433 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are an asset. From my perspective, there are far more humans that leave garbage and trample on sensitive areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Schoen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6142 **Comment Id:** 365609 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm just guessing but I imaging there were thousands of more instances of vandalism in the park during those four years. That's a "serious" problem. It's caused by people, not dogs. I've seen no effort to close off substantial portions of the GGNRA to people as you are proposing to do with dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert A Dewey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6163 **Comment Id:** 365684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The dog owners are responsible visitors, cleaning up after their pets, and others. It is often non-residents and tourists who litter, and the residents and dog owners who are cleaning up, in order to protect their dogs, and the ocean

Organization:

Commenter: Brooke R Rogers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6167 **Comment Id:** 365708 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic' (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ form other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6169 **Comment Id:** 365719 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic' (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ form other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.
Organization:
Commenter: Danielle Kirby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365753 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Sweeny Ridge/Cattle Hill I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge trail system. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if a dog is leashed it will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing. Visitor use of Sweeeny Ridge is relativity low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal. Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods

making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365754 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A) I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6691 **Comment Id:** 365782 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Racoons cyotes do more damage than dogs!

Organization:

Commenter: Janet Econone **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6391 **Comment Id:** 366064 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There is evidence that humans alone and humans with leashed dogs have greater impact on the environment. Knight and Miller (1996, Wildlife responses to pedestrians and dogs) shows that the flush distance of birds is greater for human or humans with leashed dogs than unleashed dogs. This suggests that the birds in this study view humans as more of a threat than dogs. The SEIS needs to present a balanced view of the scientific literature and as there is no consensus about the impact of off-leash dogs, site specific studies should be carried out. It is often very difficult to differentiate the impact of dogs vs humans in an area. The raw

data in the studies presented in the SEIS often shows that the conclusions reached in those studies and in the SEIS are not supported by the data. My own observations suggest that humans have a bigger impact on many of the areas sited in the SEIS. I have seen far more people and children climbing and degrading the cliffs at Fort Funston than I have seen dogs. The SEIS should observe and report of the frequency of violations by people vs. dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeffrey A Ubersax **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6218 **Comment Id:** 366136 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However, it is odd to me since all the soccer fields seem to be covered in geese feces and the trails covered in deer droppings and no one seems to care about those!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6241 **Comment Id:** 366172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What I do not believe is that there is legitimate, UNBIASED scientific evidence that offleash areas are threatening wildlife. I would be more concerned with parades, races and generally irresponsible park attendees who leave trash, fires, etc and have no incentive to keep these spaces in tact.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine B Brumback **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366224 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Like the DEIS, the SEIS also fails to put many of their claims about the negative impacts of dogs into context. The report states as fact that dogs cause soil erosion or the degradation of vegetation, but it makes no attempt to rigorously document this claim let alone compare it to the levels of erosion and degradation caused by humans. I have personally witnessed adults and children climbing up the coastal cliffs at Fort Funston and, surely, dogs are not responsible for the graffiti that can be seen carved into the cliffs. I have also witnessed people walking on the dunes near Funston Beach Trail South and using paths other than the sand ladder to travel between the upper section of Fort Funston and the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6430 **Comment Id:** 367013 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I've noticed destructive behavior on the part of moms & dads with children on West Beach (digging deep holes, building castles, pushing strollers, lugging umbrellas and beach

gear, flying drones, running electric cars both on the crushed walk path and under the fence on W. Beach). This behavior is far more destructive than anything a dog has ever done anytime I have been there. Dogs typically, run in the water, chase a stick or ball and then move on with their owners. People set up camp, stay for hours and leave behind trash & toys in the designated Snowy Plover area. Humans should have been banned from the area long before dogs. This can be proven in a balanced observation of the area.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367539 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And unfortunately, there were thousands and thousands of fireworks casings (made of cardboard, metal and plastic) that washed up on Baker Beach and Crissy Field as the result of the celebration of the Golden Gate Bridges 75th anniversary. It was the dog walkers who cleaned up this mess at Baker Beach and Crissy Field for several days running.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6632 **Comment Id:** 367549 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA's users include not only tourist-visitors but also residents of all descriptions: parents & little children, parents with bigger children, cyclists, skaters, picnickers, walkers, runners, nature lovers, dog walkers both professional and dog owners (even cat & rabbit owners) and just about any other SF resident who feels like a brief stay in a beautiful park. Members of these groups are,,alas, at one time or another messy (drop trash) and destructive (cycling on grass, crushing plants, damaging structures etc.) A vast majority of dogs are well-behaved and their owners clean up after them and they don't drop candy wrapperrs, Saran wrap, aluminum foil, coffee cups and other human detritus that is o filthy, and ugly. (I have seen humans urinate & defecate at Crissy Field). Many people don't like children and elderly folks are scared of cyclists & rowdy ball/frisbee players, who probably also frighten wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: Louise Frankel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6503 **Comment Id:** 367594 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I live near the Presidio, and have watched the Doyle Drive construction project proceed for the past several years. As I read the Draft Dog Management Plan, I don't understand how the park service can be concerned about dogs in the Presidio and not be significantly more concerned about the construction equipment, truck traffic, and chaos associated with the demolition of the old skyway and the activities associated with the digging of tunnels and development of the new drive.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6646 **Comment Id:** 368214 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I note the negative impact of businesses in the Presidio and the traffic and noise that they bring, the large charitable events that are held at Crissy Field, and special events such as the Americas Cup. There seems to be no mention of this in your report or any efforts to curtail these activities.
Organization:
Commenter: Les Nagy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have been told it is because of endangered species habitat and mixed use considerations. Despite the long history of off leash dog walking in the area, there is still habitat for a number of endangered species that no studies have been done to link off leash dog walking to negative impacts on any endangered species. In fact, the one creek in question that is within the boundaries of the off-leash area proposed by the MDG, there are more often children in the creek catching frogs and tadpoles. Unless you plan to prohibit or leash children too, perhaps education, barriers near crossing and/or proper signage would be a better alternative than shutting out users.
Organization:
Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6651 **Comment Id:** 368241 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm riting this leter becas dog are are freinds and we need them it might be bum's that liter and poop on the ground dog's should be aloud. Do not pass this plan!
Organization:
Commenter: Ivan N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368263 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are an insignificant issue related to the Bank Swallows (page 276). Currently the crows/ravens are a menace to any small bird in the Fort Funston vicinity. The EIS/ SEIS refers to a report by Black 1996 (page 325). Black's report predates the invasion of Fort Funston by the crows/ravens.
Organization:
Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 599 **Comment Id:** 368343 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I see more small children chasing birds than dogs. It would appear they are a bigger threat. Are you going to try and ban them too?
Organization:
Commenter: Timothy Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 599 **Comment Id:** 368346 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: At Ocean beach SPPA, you probably have bigger problems from teens and homeless hanging around the dunes at night then you have from walking dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Timothy Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2420 **Comment Id:** 368490 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Muir Beach: Alternative A (no action). I am often in Marin and the closest beach during my visits is Muir Beach. I think it's very unfair to make it leash only or to prohibit dogs. I feel very strongly about this. I understand the creek is a sensitive salmon habitat, but I see kids playing in the creek and in the dunes. I've seen parents chatting while their kids dig in the dunes in the off-limits area (of course the sign was half buried by drifting sand). Additionally, the creek is often closed at its mouth, unless it's storm season. I could see restricting dog access or increasing signage during sensitive salmon runs, but this shouldn't be a permanent, year-round rule. Most people's dogs just want to run along the waterline by the shore.
Organization:
Commenter: bill randt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2420 **Comment Id:** 368496 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I've seen the young plovers heading to the ocean. They are sensitive to what's going on around them, but they're not hatching year round. I've witness dogs chasing birds, but it's not usually the case. A bigger issue that I see: kids playing in the dunes and homeless people sleeping in the dunes. Isn't this the sensitive snowy plover habitat?
Organization:
Commenter: bill randt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5457 **Comment Id:** 368648 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On Mori Ridge Trail, I have witnessed trimming of overgrown vegetation (including coastal scrub) up to 4 feet on either side of the trail. This annual maintenance surely causes more impacts to sensitive habitat along this trail system than trail users (including dogs).
Organization:

Commenter: Brett Becker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4506 **Comment Id:** 368684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Further examining Crissy Field, the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. I cannot tell you the number of children I have seen running on the dunes in protected areas where the snowy plover live, families picnicking and playing football right in front of "protected wilderness area" signs, wind surfers displacing people walking on the beach (with and without dogs), trash being thrown around and not in the cans, etc.... Your data has a very narrow lens and, on its own, simply does not statically support the request the need for a change.
Organization:
Commenter: kathryn Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4506 **Comment Id:** 368686 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS seems to select dog walking as a single threat to the GGNRA. What about the negative impact of very large groups that use the spaces (and take over large areas and roadway access) for events, what about the terrible light pollution emitted from the sports facilities at the west end of Crissy Field ?
Organization:
Commenter: kathryn Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4503 **Comment Id:** 368689 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: One of the highlights of my day is to walk on the path along the beach and watch the dogs playing. Most of the dog owners are very responsible and pick up after their dogs. I'm more dismayed at the horse poop that is left by the park police horses that never gets cleaned up. I'm amazed at how well-behaved the dogs are. i so enjoy their romping and chasing and running.
Organization:
Commenter: Helen M Kloepfer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4005 **Comment Id:** 368800 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The failure to distinguish between impacts on GGNRA resources by people, by dogs, or by other causes is perhaps the most basic scientific and policy flaw in the current document. The SDEIS's basic reasoning is that because dogs are capable of causing certain

impacts to the natural environment, they will cause those impacts and thereby impair the ecological integrity of GGNRA. (See, for example, pages 15-20 of the SDEIS and much of the chapters on alternatives, environmental consequences, and affected environment.) Site specific, empirical data is lacking on this point. Equally important, while the current draft identifies impacts from humans and dogs - site specific observations like "high foot traffic (both people and dogs)" - there is little or no analysis of: (1) whether off leash areas differ from other areas of high traffic; and (2) whether humans need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural values. For example, the impacts of the many special events in GGNRA, such as Crissy Field, relative to impacts from people and their dogs is not seriously analyzed. Any management plan that does not deal with the causes of the perceived, alleged or documented impacts does not meet the basic objectives of preserving GGNRA's values - because the impacts will still happen after the adopting of an overly restrictive dog management plan. Making dogs the scapegoats is not objective analysis. And if the document does not tell the public that people, too, will be restricted from popular areas of GGNRA, it fails NEPA's requirement for a "full disclosure" of impacts (in this case, impacts on recreation).

Organization:

Commenter: Kenneth S Weiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4287 **Comment Id:** 368818 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The DEIS is concentrated on dogs, and ignores impacts caused by people and their children, mountain bikers, fleet week, walk-a -thons, feral cats, coyotes, horses, surfers, etc etc. In other words. The DEIS appears to be a targeted exercise. Not a 360 degree look at the panorama affecting the GGNRA

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Norton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6602 **Comment Id:** 368868 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I'm am writing about the law that had been changed because you men you blamded the dog for it and you do not no who did it it could have been homeless people drug diller and can you please change it back because if are dogs stay in the house for a long time and thay will start to tare up the houses then we will have to clean up the mess

Organization:

Commenter: Damaya NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369325 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On the other hand, Ms. Hatch did not document the more significant matter of the deaths and disturbances of plovers perpetrated by predators such as the gull, raven, and crow. The gull, raven, and crow are documented predators of the plover, while dogs are not. Ravens are black, cousins of the crow, and larger than crows - generally about two feet long. Federal

officials, who attribute the soaring numbers of ravens to sharp increases in road-kill and garbage from fast food restaurants, admit that the population explosion is troubling, given the bird's intelligence.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369326 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The effects of other wildlife and other possible interferences with the plover's daily activities were given but brief mention and not factored into the study in any meaningful way. These issues include the following: beach cleaning, off-road vehicles driven at night, activity of specific predators, non-native vegetation, shoreline erosion control projects (bulldozers), the actual width of the beach available to the plover, weather, helicopters, airplanes, bicycles, vehicles used during the day by Park staff, kites, and an oil spill. An evaluator cannot distinguish the reason or reasons why a plover flies away to another spot given the presence of a dog 40 feet away, a raven 50 feet away, and a plane flying overhead. Yet in the Hatch study, it seems clear the dog would be identified as the factor that disturbed the plover.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369332 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Internal GGNRA records show the GGNRA bargained with USFWS in 1996, sacrificing our off-leash recreational opportunities in order to get USFWS to agree to allow bulldozing in this same area of Ocean Beach. The ESA is very clear that it is not permissible to modify the habitat of an endangered or threatened species when they are not present, but expected to return. One example would be the prohibition of the removal of trees that hold an eagle's nest, even when the eagle is not present or utilizing the nest. We understand the GGNRA is modifying the beach in this area to minimize the effects of erosion and the drifting of sand on to the Promenade and Great Highway. The GGNRA has refused to acknowledge in any significant fashion that erosion and the progressive collapse of the shoreline limits the areas where the plover can roost and forage, as well as the quality of foodsource for the plover at Ocean Beach. The narrowing beach puts the plover in closer and closer proximity to all users of the beach, thereby increasing the disturbance to the plovers. These conditions will progress despite the GGNRA's move to ban dogs entirely.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGNRA personnel routinely drive off-road vehicles through the plover habitat in order to enforce the leash law at Ocean Beach. Certainly the GGNRA's "solution" is far more

dangerous to the plover than the perceived "problem"

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369334 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In 2006, the Fourth Annual Ocean Beach Turkey Trot was an event sanctioned by the GGNRA (and SFRPD) for 1000 participants. Certainly the GGNRA recognized there would be additional participants who had not officially registered. Members of Ocean Beach DOG who witnessed the race estimated 1500 participants. The course for the race was charted directly through the Snowy Plover Protection Area. This was also during a time period where the GGNRA declared an "emergency" warranting the restriction of off-leash recreation in this same area in order to minimize "disturbance" to the plover. The GGNRA, by granting permits for the Ocean Beach Turkey Trot, established that their ban of off-leash recreation is arbitrary, capricious and discriminatory-therefore unlawful.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369339 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For example, an off-leash dog is running at the waterline with its owner and they are some 20 feet from a plover. There is additionally a raven 30 feet and closing from the plover. The plover flushes, and it is recorded as a "disturbance". How is it apparent to the observer whether the dog, the owner or the raven was the source of the disturbance? Practically, it could be any combination of all three. Based upon the premise of this study, it is reasonable to assume the disturbance/harassment would be attributed to the off-leash dog. Is that legitimate? There does not appear to be any attempt made to isolate all other activities within the Park that may adversely affect the plover-they are merely given mention. These would include: Beach patrols in vehicles on the beach, equestrian use of the beach, people walking or jogging, kite flying, littering which attracts predators, the predators (usually ravens) themselves, and removal of kelp or driftwood which are sources of food. No mention is even made of bonfires, camping, litter such as cigarette butts, or the shadows surfboards cast.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369340 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This Lafferty report states "The distance between human activity and the roost peaked at about 30 meters and relatively few people or dogs beyond this distance disturbed plovers" ...presumably because a narrow beach increased the potential overlap between beach users and snowy plovers". Ocean Beach suffers from serious erosion, and hence the beach width has narrowed dramatically, especially during high tides. It could more reasonably be concluded

that the narrowed beach width is directly responsible for both the lower plover numbers and the increased frequency of perceived harassment/disturbance of the plover, not the greater number of dogs or their activities on or off of a leash

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369429 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS misrepresents the activities of the GGNRA during the time frame of 1994-1998 as follows: " The total number of bank swallow burrows observed at the site from 1993 to 2006 through the NPS monitoring program has ranged from a high of 924 burrows in 1994 (Chow 1996, 2) to a low of 140 burrows observed in 1998 (NPS 2007c, 3). The number of burrows was high for the years 1993 through 1996, with total counts above 500 burrows (NPS 2007c, 3). Storm events associated with El Nino conditions during the winter of 1997 into 1998 wiped out all the burrows through heavy erosion at the site (NPS 2007c, 3). The cliffs are subject to rapid erosion from storm events outside the breeding season (NPS 2007c, 1)." We would point out, again, that the native plant restorations were designed to increase "natural" erosion and create "moving sand" ecology. It seems rather self-evident that these native plant "restorations" contributed greatly to the demise of the FF Bank Swallows in the specified time frame.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369432 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Because of a total failure to study causal effects of various activities on the Bank Swallow, the GGNRA/ NPS has no evidence linking recreational activity with the Bank Swallow decline at Fort Funston. Indeed, the best evidence that recreational activity does not impact the Bank Swallow negatively is the swallows' departure from the fenced off northern cliffs to their present location - - an area of continuous recreational activity. The overwhelming evidence indicates that the GGNRA/ NPS native plant projects and the erosion they have caused have negatively impacted the Bank Swallow colony.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369484 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The idea that cultural resources such as buried missile silos at Fort Funston require protection from dogs trampling, digging or urinating is far-fetched at best. I would point out that the larger size and weight of humans would be a greater threat to trample notable sites than would dogs. With respect to missile silos at Fort Funston I would not assume all urine deposited would be that of the canine visitors. The GGNRA still has not installed any permanent bathrooms for the many human visitors at Fort Funston. In fact, it seems the GGNRA has little

regard for the enjoyment of these resources.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6580 **Comment Id:** 369514 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are far more issues - and more important issues - - arising from humans degrading the area, such as during the fourth of July fireworks at Crissy, than there are from dogs degrading the area. At least the dogs have responsible humans picking up after them; sadly, the humans dont often pick up after themselves.

Organization:

Commenter: Gina Symczak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/30/2014)

PN4000 Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority (Substantive)

1. **Commenters noted that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area must conduct site-specific peer-reviewed studies to warrant any policy changes. Because of the lack of studies, commenters feel that the Management Plan cannot be implemented, as there is no basis for the changes to the current policies.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1275 **Comment Id:** 352221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Your GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation, the Memorandum of Understanding with SF for this park property, and NPS Rules, Regulations and Policy because they have failed to perform "vital monitoring" which NPS considers an essential element of sound principles of land use, planning and management. GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources due to the presence of dogs nor their guardians, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes. Federal law requires site-specific, peer reviewed studies to justify and guide changes in management of National Park System resources.The SEIS acknowledges the GGNRA has no such site-specific, peer reviewed studies for the impact of dogs and their guardians on water quality, vegetation, soils and wildlife in the GGNRA.

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6685 **Comment Id:** 369027 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Clearly, the failure of GGNRA management to conduct any consistent monitoring of the resources of the GGNRA is a violation of Federal law. The more fundamental problem this SEIS highlights is the fact that GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation for this park property. GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes. It seems impossible that GGNRA management would undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies as a means to identify the alleged impairment.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Several commenters feel that the role of Golden Gate National Recreation Area is not to support dog ownership. These commenters feel that GGNRA should focus on protecting natural resources and manage dog walking accordingly.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5793 **Comment Id:** 364314 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a CA Species of Special Concern, the NPS is will within its authority and is, frankly, duty-bound to afford the highest possible protection for the plovers. Not only will the plovers benefit from strictly limiting access for dogs, rare plants, amphibians, and microhabitats well benefit, too.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6034 **Comment Id:** 365009 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGNRA governing officials and scientist must take ever precautionary step to protect the GGNRA's resources. If this means either having no dogs in area(s) at all, or having dogs only in specifically designated areas, then the GGNRA should have full authority to issue such a regulations and be given the power to fully enforce them.

Organization:

Commenter: Ernie Jay **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Two commenters stated that Golden Gate National Recreation Area does not have the right to dictate management of the tidewaters, as they are under California State law, which does not have leash laws.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 4993 **Comment Id:** 361897 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA has no power to regulate the tidelands it manages in the GGNRA. The GGNRA does not own these tidelands; they are held in trust by the State of California for the recreational uses of the citizenry. The management permit between the GGNRA and the California State Lands Commission only allows imposition of federal law to the extent it does not conflict with State law. There have never been any on-leash laws on the tidelands in the Bay Area managed by the GGNRA. Accordingly, State and federal law conflict on this issue and, pursuant to the management permit, the GGNRA must follow State law in attempting to change the historical uses of these tidelands. The California Administrative Procedures Act is far more exacting than federal law when it comes to changes in land management that are significant or highly controversial. As a result, the GGNRA, in following federal law, has violated the management permit and forfeited management over the tidelands it manages.

Organization: Stephen S. Sayad, Attorney at Law

Commenter: Stephen S Sayad **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. Several commenters questioned the inclusion of commercial dog walkers in the management plan, stating that the NPS should revise or remove commercial dog walking from the plan.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366033 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not justify why commercial dog walking (CDW) is included as a component of the Preferred Alternative. A proper evaluation should examine whether commercial dog walking is consistent with applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies, which in this case include the Organic Act, the GGNRA enabling legislation, the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998, the National Environmental Policy Act, NPS Management Policies 2006, and Director's Order #53. While some may argue that dog walking is part of the mission of the GGNRA and was intrinsic in the "values or purposes for which the park was established", no one can credibly argue that the commercial enterprise of dog walking-i.e., walking a dog that you do not own for financial gain-can in any way be considered part of the GGNRA's mission or core values or purposes. Commercial dog walking does not meet the criteria to be authorized as an appropriate activity for national parklands. It constitutes a commercial exploitation of park resources (both in environmental impacts and personnel to manage the activity). To our knowledge, commercial dog walking is not allowed in any other unit of the National Park System. Rather, where commercial activities are allowed, they are permitted only to the extent that they provide for or enhance park visitor experiences. Commercial dog walking does not provide any park enhancement benefit. At a minimum, the SEIS must be revised to demonstrate how this commercial activity complies with applicable laws and regulations.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. Golden Gate National Recreation Area has traditionally been used for dog walking. As the NRA is not a national park, commenters feel that the management plan has misrepresented the enabling legislation and mission, stating that it was established to maximize recreation opportunities for residents of the City of San Francisco and visitors. Several commenters wish to see the Pet Policy of 1979 formalized.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1629 **Comment Id:** 353224 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that "In many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities." (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - "The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to ... expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972).

Organization: many see comment for list of some of many
Commenter: richard j lynch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 951 **Comment Id:** 353817 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The legislation which created the GGNRA states, in part; The objective of H.R. 16444 is to assure the preservation of open spaces presently prevailing within the proposed recreation area, to provide public access along the waterfront, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available to the region. Please note the phrase "maximum extent possible". Restricting areas where dogs are allowed and requiring leashes in areas previously allowing off leash is clearly contrary to the intent of establishing legislation. Alternative F clearly reduces outdoor recreational opportunities.
Organization:
Commenter: Walter Reinsdorf **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2016 **Comment Id:** 354688 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2736 **Comment Id:** 357152 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In looking at the POLICY ON THE ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF (NATIONAL) RECREATION AREAS, the #1 point is to provide investment in outdoor recreation that is more clearly responsive to RECREATION DEMAND than other investments that are based primarily upon considerations of preserving unique natural or historical resources, the need to develop and conserve public lands and forests, or the requirements of major water resource development undertakings. The recreation demand for local citizens comes from dog owners - over 50% o San Francisco residents have dogs. While you reference point #3 in your study, there is not mention on point #1. Please consider this motivation of the establishment of Recreation Areas in your analysis.
Organization:
Commenter: Douglas Bentz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5844 **Comment Id:** 364388 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: By enabling this abitrary disinfranchisement of a specific class of GGNRA users, the GGNRA/NPS is violating the 1972 Congressional enabling legislation and the mandate to manage the GGNRA lands for public recreation. Repeat; public RECREATION, not conservation, not habitat restoration, not development, just public RECREATION.
GGNRA/NPS appears to be exhibiting a bad case of "mission creep" or "mission slippage" on its substitution of "conservation/habitat restoration" and "park visitor experience" for "recreational park user".

Organization:

Commenter: Dianne N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 80 **Comment Id:** 343280 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There should be no general ban on dogs, off-leash or otherwise, from any significant portion of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. As the name implies, this is primarily a *recreation area*, not a wilderness area. It is in proximity to a large city. It is not realistic to try to maintain this area in some sort of pristine state of nature.

Organization: Libertarian Party of San Francisco

Commenter: Starchild N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 181 **Comment Id:** 349995 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have ask numerous time WHY this is being proposed - what studies have been done to indicate that the parks need dogs removed or the psychological impact of the residence of this great city of ours who are dog owner that can no longer spend time in the open air with our beloved pets. PLEASE SEND THE DATA, THE STUDIES or a SENSE OF WHY this is important.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean Templin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 373 **Comment Id:** 351281 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The Dog Management Plan does not reflect the requirement to maintain traditional recreation in the GGNRA, noted also in the Congressional Record in 1972.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1012 **Comment Id:** 351432 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRAs purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space (Enabling legislation, first paragraph).

Organization:

Commenter: Lawrence Skaggs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1031 **Comment Id:** 351455 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is very important to me to retain the off leash dog walking rights in the GGNRA, in the areas that it has historically been allowed, for my health and for the health of my

dogs. I feel that you are mis using your authority when you make rules trying to take away the rights of American citizens for no good reason.

Organization:

Commenter: deborah l riat **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1035 **Comment Id:** 351463 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It would seem that restricting the off leash dog walk area would be in contrast to the intent, and possibly the letter of, the granting of the land to the city. This would also seem to be denying a service to the community. There are many areas for people to walk alone or with a leashed dog, including Ft. Funston, but there are very limited areas for people to have their dogs off leash. Please, leave the park as is in terms of allowing off-leash access.

Organization:

Commenter: Arthur Storey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1100 **Comment Id:** 351638 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA is a national recreation area, not a national park. But the dog management plan misrepresents the GGNRA's enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea L Buffa **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1231 **Comment Id:** 352037 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA, by its own rules, must conduct site-specific, peer-reviewed studies as the foundation for any policy changes intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The GGNRA acknowledges the required studies do not exist. This renders the proposed policy changes arbitrary and capricious, and as such they are unlawful and cannot be implemented. The ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy should be reinstated per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. For lands added after the drafting of the original 1979 Pet Policy, DOI policy requires historical usage be maintained. Any changes would have to be justified by the requisite site-specific, peer-reviewed studies followed by a formal rulemaking process.

Organization:

Commenter: Erin Conklin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1232 **Comment Id:** 352038 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA, by its own rules, must conduct site-specific, peer-reviewed studies as the foundation for any policy changes intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The GGNRA acknowledges the required studies do not exist. This renders the proposed policy changes arbitrary and capricious, and as such they are unlawful and cannot be implemented. The ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy should be reinstated per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. For lands added after the drafting of the original 1979 Pet Policy, DOI policy requires historical usage be maintained. Any changes would have to be justified by the requisite site-specific, peer-reviewed studies followed by a formal rulemaking process.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Aikin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1287 **Comment Id:** 352246 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space.

Organization:

Commenter: Natalie Tondelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1300 **Comment Id:** 352266 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Osteen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1324 **Comment Id:** 352313 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard J Harris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1363 **Comment Id:** 352397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA is overstepping its domain.
Organization:
Commenter: Eric Liu **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1375 **Comment Id:** 352415 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.
Organization: Sir Walks-Alot Dog Training
Commenter: Robert L Jupe Jr. **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1596 **Comment Id:** 353172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.
Organization:
Commenter: Chelsea Novello **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4485 **Comment Id:** 353836 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Tree Gelb Stuber **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5310 **Comment Id:** 354493 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: ilia s gvozdenovic **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2925 **Comment Id:** 355223 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: GGNRA's new proposal is arbitrary and capricious, not based in valid science.

It is also an unjustified "taking" of lands given in trust by the City of San Francisco. Is this another egregious example of Federal overreaching? This proposal should be immediately reviewed at a higher level and rejected. ..

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Irene Rubey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3677 **Comment Id:** 355596 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Based on their dismissal of dog owners voice, the SEIS should not be given power to "use its judgement" over fence and leash laws - as we all know where that could lead us, based on their unwillingness to work with dogs, dog owners, and dog walkers.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Kathryn Jain **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2092 **Comment Id:** 355682 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE GGNRA , SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO CHANGE LEASH LAWS IN PARTICULAR GGNRA AREAS JUST BECAUSE IT DEEMS THAT NOT ENOUGH PEOPLE ARE COMPLYING TO LEASH RESTRICTIONS.

Organization: Self

Commenter: Angela Sharp **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2110 **Comment Id:** 355741 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study, AS REQUIRED BY LAW that supports such a drastic restriction of dog friendly areas. It must be proven before it is legislated!

Organization:

Commenter: Annette M Sullivan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2114 **Comment Id:** 355746 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed site-specific studies or vital monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to inititate such a dramatic change to the public use of their own public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Lindsay McCrea **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2115 **Comment Id:** 355749 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Paul Buxbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2121 **Comment Id:** 355757 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed site-specific studies or vital monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to initiate such a dramatic change to the public use of their own public lands

Organization:

Commenter: Kathy L **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2766 **Comment Id:** 357398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design.

Organization:

Commenter: john cremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2810 **Comment Id:** 357540 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The path toward permits and further restrictions flies in the face of the GGNRA's mandate to be an accessible urban recreation area. Even the name describes its planned purpose.

Organization:

Commenter: Tamsen Bell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2378 **Comment Id:** 358451 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

Organization:

Commenter: Aparna L Reddy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2589 **Comment Id:** 359127 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Increased usage over time was anticipated when this National Recreation Area

was created. The House Report No 92-1391 made clear that the GGNRA would be confronted with problems in San Francisco that would require careful planning because of the high volume year-round visitation: "As a national urban recreation area, this new component of the national park system will be confronted with problems which do not frequently occur at other national park and recreation areas. Great numbers of people can be expected to use the area-particularly those portions located in San Francisco County." (pg. 11) ****** . In October, 1977, Rolf Diamont, GGNRA "Environmental Coordinator" prepared a memo proposing a "Draft Dog Policy for San Francisco Unit." His memo enumerated the following guidelines: 1. "No regulation, verbal or written, should be attempted that cannot be reasonably and consistently administered." 2. "Dog regulations should be different for different areas of the park reflecting public needs and attitudes as well as urban geography and our capabilities." 3. "When we discourage or restrict dogs in any area, whenever possible, an alternative site where dogs are allowed should be suggested.

Organization: SaveOffLeash.com

Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3405 **Comment Id:** 359143 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA branch of the NPS is completely ignoring its enabling legislation and reneging on promises made to San Francisco when we gave city parkland to the GGNRA in 1973. The GGNRA has (conveniently)forgotten that it was created for the "maintenance of needed recreational open space." A Report issued by the House of Representatives makes it clear that the GGNRA was created to address concerns about a lack of recreational open space in San Francisco. It noted: "In San Francisco.... the opportunities for outdoor recreation in broad open spaces are severely limited." It also said: "This legislation will ... [establish] a new national urban recreational area which will concentrate on serving the outdoor recreational needs of the people of the metropolitan area." And "The objective of H.R. 16444 is to assure the preservation of open space presently prevailing within the proposed recreation area, to provide public access along the waterfront, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available to the region." During the hearings various recreational activities within the proposed GGNRA boundaries were listed and those included off-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Lindsay Kefauver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3783 **Comment Id:** 359627 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If instead the purpose is consistent with enabling legislation, the 1979 Pet Policy and a fair assessment of the no-project Alternative A would be more compelling than any of the action proposals considered in the SEIS, which all seen to denigrate any dog walking that deviates from strict interpretation of 36 CFR 2.15, the dog-walking regulation that applies to the various scenic destination national parks such as Yosemite, which are different from the recreation area.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4035 **Comment Id:** 360272 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: it misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."
Organization:
Commenter: Kristen Aramthanapon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4526 **Comment Id:** 360477 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan is in direct conflict with the spirit of the use of the land - which is to use it as a recreational area. The GGNRA was built and designed for dog-walking from the beginning, to allow city residents the ability to walk their dogs in a recreational area. In fact, congressional reports specifically named dog walking as one of the uses for the space when the GGNRA was created.
Organization:
Commenter: Alexander Livingston **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4544 **Comment Id:** 360502 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I support the status quo. It seems to me that the 1979 pet policy is working very well, and the new draft policy and EIR are not premised on evidence that a change is needed or warranted. To the contrary. If the draft proposed policy were enacted there would be significant adverse impacts. These have not been adequately studied. You would not only reduce the recreational enjoyment for large numbers of people who use the GGRA, you would unduly stress certain areas that remain approved for dogs, as well as SF city parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeffrey J Cole **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4546 **Comment Id:** 360534 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Incident reports from 2013 show a small number of dog-related incidents within the hundreds of thousands of visits to the GGNRA, much smaller than the number of reported incidents involving people; again, data that does not support the need for such a drastic change nor the request for a staggering $2 million for more rangers.
Organization:
Commenter: Vicki B Tiernan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4642 **Comment Id:** 361161 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When Rep Burton first proposed ceding Our beaches to GGNRA it was always identified that the use and enjoyment of those beachs would not be reduced or restricted. Not only are the proposasls exactly contradictory of that stated intent but they clearly failed to take into account all of the comments, are no different from what was proposed before the comment period, were not the product of a truly transparent or fully participatory comment period, apply an identified bias, and fail to understand the use of the lands for an urban community that cares passionately about it's parks

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Gropper-Nelson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4680 **Comment Id:** 361318 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe that this change is also contradictory to the NPS mission as it will drastically reduce the enjoyment of these areas for both dog owners as well as non-dog owners alike.

Organization:

Commenter: Lawrence Lin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4716 **Comment Id:** 361382 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is not the mission of the GGNRA to assist or promote dog ownership. Therefore, park officials need to enforce the dog rules vigorously.

Organization:

Commenter: Saw Lim-Skain **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4735 **Comment Id:** 361414 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe that this change is also contradictory to the NPS mission as it will drastically reduce the enjoyment of these areas for both dog owners as well as non-dog owners alike.

Organization:

Commenter: Samantha Stevick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4781 **Comment Id:** 361514 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly oppose the GGNRA's new draft of the dog management plan. Public San Francisco beaches were designated by an act of Congress in 1972 to give open spaces to the residents and visitors of San Francisco. The people of the city are dependent upon this public space for recreation of many kinds, and it would be unfair to repeal this privilege (especially

since the city continues to grow in population).

Organization:

Commenter: Katherine Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4791 **Comment Id:** 361542 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA's mission is to provide access to nature for residents of an urban area. It's an essential mission - having open places that urban residents and visitors can enjoy and to foster taking care of our natural environment. AND, it's a fact that urban dwellers have pets who bring joy and companionship into their lives. These pets deserve space to enjoy fresh air and exercise. These elements are important components to good health and disposition.

Organization: retired

Commenter: Ann Sasaki **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4815 **Comment Id:** 361581 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When San Francisco granted GGNRA the open space lands in our 7 mile by 7 mile city, it was with the granted promise these lands would be for recreation as it had been since it began. Now the GGNRA wants to go back on their promise for made up excuses.

Organization: San Francisco citizen and dog owner

Commenter: Felicia J Zeiger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4943 **Comment Id:** 361802 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, these recreation areas are intended to function as social "steam release valves" to allow residents of a heavily populated Bay Area access to fresh air, quiet, undeveloped scenic land to relax, get exercise, spend time with friends, and enjoy some peace. I respect the National Park Service's commitment to ecological protection, but I know that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was given over to National Park Service leadership with the agreement that these parks were to remain as recreation areas (which we know serve a different purpose from much-needed nature refuges).

Organization:

Commenter: Shana Goldin-Perschbacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4986 **Comment Id:** 361893 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It appears that the SEIS is a fatally flawed document with no peer-reviewed, site specific monitoring or data and that there is no legitimate or legal basis for the proposed changes.

Organization: Private individual

Commenter: Lee Heughan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5185 **Comment Id:** 362527 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA was not created to "offer a National Park experience". It resulted from a legislative mandate to "preserve for public use and enjoyment" and "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" in this unique urban environment. This mandate for public recreational use must surely include appropriate provision for traditional dog-walking activities that predated the creation of the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen Gimber **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5188 **Comment Id:** 362537 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: To deprive ANY dog from walking, running and playing on the fire trails is inconsistent with the original planned use of the area, and violates the long established norms of our community to regularly enjoy the outdoors with our well-behaved and voice-controlled pets.
Organization:
Commenter: Alice A Gleghorn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5268 **Comment Id:** 362840 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: To restrict the recreational access of over half the tax paying households in the area is heavy-handed and wrong. The GGNRA has completely lost touch with the mission and intent with which these spaces were created. It's clear that the needs and desires of the citizenry are not fairly being taken into account.
Organization:
Commenter: Caroleen Beatty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5303 **Comment Id:** 362928 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I truly question the wisdom though of taking away such an essential urban environment in violation of the original intent by which it was acquired. I know that intent because I made the case for it at inception and was in fact supported in that brief by the first local director of the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Dan Kaljian **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5306 **Comment Id:** 362936 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I don't feel that your mandate to manage the recreation area includes the

intention or the direction for the exclusion of so many people from use of these facilities. Management might mean co- ordinating the various uses and users to everyone's satisfaction. All of the stakeholders should be accommodated if you are doing your job.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert M Hanssen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5357 **Comment Id:** 363009 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new regulation is a contradiction to the 1979 agreement for use already in place. The areas in question do not fall under the guidance and use of national parks and should NOT be subject to those regulations.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5469 **Comment Id:** 363325 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

Organization:

Commenter: Julie Samuels **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5651 **Comment Id:** 364074 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA dog management plan violates the spirit and intent of the GGNRA. As part of the original 1972 Act, the area now known as GGNRA was authorized as an area of recreation with the intent of providing green space for visitors and residents alike.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Pecevich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5740 **Comment Id:** 364206 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In 1972 the beaches were given to the public by SF congress, and as you know in 1979 the beaches and trails were designed for public use with dogs in the plans. The notion that the these parks not allow dogs off leash juxtaposes the initial planning of these parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex M Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5771 **Comment Id:** 364275 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA is not following the law and is making unilateral decisions regarding public lands. It was also acting against the very reason it was established - to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5774 **Comment Id:** 364277 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We need MORE off-leash areas - not less. GGNRA should honor the agreement under which they are managing the land - not waste our money on creating the plans we do not need.
Organization:
Commenter: Anastasia Glikshtern **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5806 **Comment Id:** 364341 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA was designed to be a place for urban residents to enjoy nature, these new restrictions are contrary to that charter when considered from the perspective of a resident who finds most enjoyment in experiencing these lands with their canine companion.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Zimmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6101 **Comment Id:** 365417 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: You misrepresent the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA: the purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space (Enabling legislation, first paragraph).
Organization:
Commenter: Dave Emanuel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366085 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: CDW will have unacceptable impacts on the park including: - Large groups of dogs and commercial dog walking vehicles will create an aesthetic in the park similar to that of a dog park-including related visuals, sounds, and odors. - NPS personnel will have to dedicate more time to regulating CDW, increasing the economic impact that CDW will have on park resources without recouping costs from the businesses-the dog walkers-profiting from exploiting park resources. - CDWs will typically bring in many more dogs than private dog owners and

walkers, resulting in increased displacement of dog owners and other park users. Notably, the SEIS fails to address any such impacts.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366245 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: A fundamental question not thoroughly explored in the SEIS, as it was not the 2011 DEIS, is why a drastic change in the mission of the GGNRA is justified at all. When Bay Area cities and counties turned over much of their open spaces in 1972 to create the GGNRA, they did so with the understanding that all residents of their urban areas would continue to have a place to enjoy open-space and experience nature under a variety of circumstances. The founding legislation cites as the primary goal provid[ing] for recreational and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management not the reverse. The GGNRA was never meant to be exclusively a nature preserve and certainly not to offer visitors a national park experience as the SEIS states. It is vital that it continue to balance the recreational needs of the community, including dog-owners, with its commitment to the environment. For this reason, it is important that, as the GGNRA expands in the future, it incorporate established dog policies into its management of newly acquired lands rather than automatically restricting access for dog walkers.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6608 **Comment Id:** 367150 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: WHEREAS, in contrast to the intent of the 1972 enabling legislation to provide recreational open space and serve the outdoor recreation needs of the surrounding metropolitan areas, the 2011 Draft General Management Plan called for much of the GGNRA land 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, with few amenities, where challenge, risk, and testing of outdoor skills would be important to most visitors

Organization: Marin County Board of Supervisors

Commenter: Kathrin Sears **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367529 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This DSEIS is clearly biased against dog walking. According to the 1972 GGNRA enabling legislation, the GGNRA should be protecting one of its core values, recreation. Both the House and Senate reports identify dog walking as a popular recreational activity but the benefits for dog walking are not properly recognized in this document.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6640 **Comment Id:** 367567 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I don't believe this is what John Muir had in mind when he lobbied for Yosemite to be preserved or Teddy Roosevelt when he created the initial parks. The National Parks should stand apart from local Parks, as more than a recreation area for dogs. They should provide sanctuary for their inhabitants, as well as a place humans, can experience the natural world in a non-intrusive way
Organization:
Commenter: John O'Hara **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 550 **Comment Id:** 368318 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation, the Memorandum of Understanding with SF for this park property, and NPS Rules, Regulations and Policy because they have failed to perform "vital monitoring" which NPS considers an essential element of sound principles of land use, planning and management.
Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4256 **Comment Id:** 368464 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS fails to demonstrate that commercial dog walking meets the NPS criteria for Special Use Permitting as set forth in the Organic Act, the GGNRA enabling legislation, and NPS Director's Order #53. The SEIS fails to enumerate or to apply these criteria to an evaluation of the appropriateness of commercial dog walking in the GGNRA, and fails to express sufficient conclusions that justify the inclusion of commercial dog walking as a component of the Preferred Alternative. As a decision document, the SEIS fails to articulate a rational connection between the presented material and the final decision. As such, we urge the Park Service to eliminate the commercial dog walking component from the Preferred Alternative.
Organization:
Commenter: Matthew & JoAnn Zlatunich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6550 **Comment Id:** 368579 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: GGNRA is the only national park with off-leash zones. Un-leashed dogs and wildlife are not compatible and should be kept physically separated In our national parks.
Organization:
Commenter: NA NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6685 **Comment Id:** 369013 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However they have violated the law by ignoring the fundamental legal underpinnings provided by the enabling legislation, NPS Laws, Rules, Regulations and Policy as well as additional Federal Law which prohibits agency actions which are arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6685 **Comment Id:** 369016 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The lack of data or any documentation to support the assertions used as justification to proceed with this Environmental Review violates Federal Law as it renders this agency action arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion. Accordingly, this agency action, findings and conclusions should be set aside as prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 706 (2)A.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369140 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Although this 1979 Pet Policy was consistent with the statutory mandate for the GGNRA to provide "needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment" and required by the promise made to San Francisco when city property was donated to the park, officials in Washington D.C. did not finalize the Section Seven Special Regulation to bring their regulations into compliance with the enabling statute. Subsequently the 1979 Pet Policy guidelines were incorporated into the 1982 Natural Resources Management Plan as Appendix C. The duplicity lay in the GGNRA's intentional failure to designate the 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation-the type of regulation

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369445 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA has also embarked on a mission to create native plant habitats where no habitat previously existed. GGNRA management alleges this is a part of their obligation to "preserve" the park for future enjoyment, however, this is NOT what they are doing. When you read the overview for Fort Funston, it is abundantly clear that they are creating these native plant habitats, and in doing so they are destroying parts of the park that existed long before the GGNRA took control. This process is not preserving anything. Additionally, this is in violation of their authorizing directive, as they insist establishment of native plant areas requires

the exclusion of humans from the site, eliminating all recreational activity in the area.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369451 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA intends to ban the recreational activities of dogs and their guardians upon the tidelands that are adjacent to GGNRA beaches. These tidelands remain subject to State "public trust" uses and may not have their longstanding recreational usage turned into purely conservation areas without violating State law and the terms of the permit under which the GGNRA manages some of these tidelands. The GGNRA's position that the public trust doctrine goes into "dormancy" while it manages these tidelands is without any legal support. The 1987 permit specifically allows for enforcement of federal regulations on these State-owned tidelands only to the extent they are not inconsistent with State law. The "public trust" doctrine has been significant State law since California's admission into the Union in 1850. The general recreational uses of these tidelands are not subject to federal rulemaking of any type.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6568 **Comment Id:** 369564 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The current preferred alternative does not adhere to the enabling legislation to provide for needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning. Off leash dog walking was described as one of the recreational activities to take place on GGNRA lands when Ft. Funston was given by the city of San Francisco to the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Wilford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/30/2014)

PN7000 Purpose and Need: Adequacy of EIS Purpose and Need (Substantive)

1. **Many commenters expressed concern that the NPS does not provide solid evidence for the need of the management plan. Commenters do not agree that just because GGNRA is a park of the national parks system it should follow the same management rules as other units.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5227 **Comment Id:** 362705 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The NPS does not demonstrate a need for action. In the Plans pre-amble, the Plan argues for action because the parks resources and values, as defined by the parks enabling legislation, could be compromised without action. NPS does not make a compelling case that the existing 1979 Pet Policy is at odds with the recreational mandate of the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: David Nielsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5336 **Comment Id:** 362978 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Finally, we do not believe that the fact that the GGNRA is part of the National Parks System - - with its own history of leash-laws and rules - - is a sufficient reason for changing those in the GGNRA. In general, the NPS was created in order to both maintain existing natural beauty and eco-systems, and allow the public to experience them pristinely.

Organization:

Commenter: Kern Trembath **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6595 **Comment Id:** 369588 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The basis for the SEIS - the Purpose and Need for Action - needs to be completely revised to address two fundamental inadequacies" i. The first part of the need statement asserts the resources/values could be impacted ("A draft plan/SEIS is needed because GGNRA resources and values, as defined by the park's enabling legislation with the NPS Organic Act, could be compromised to the extent that, without action, those resources and values in some areas of the park might not be available for enjoyment by future generations.") The document continues to describe possible impacts, biological and health-safety, that are not backed by credible studies, observations, or science in the GGNRA. The issues raised arwe conjecture rather than real issues based on solid data. ii. The second part of the need statement implies that all NPS areas need to be regulated in a consistent manner ("Additionally, a dog management policy inconsistent with NPS regulations and increased public expectations for use of the park for dog recreation has resulted in controversy, litigation, and compromised visitor

experience and resulting in resource degredation. The conflicts will likely escalate if not addressed in a comprehensive draft plan/SEIS." Parks have different values and resources and should be managed accordingly. Adaptive management is very much an accepted principle, and the Park Service should consider this in the management of its different resources. Recreation has long been an important value of the urban GGNRA. The "need" statement implies the NPS doesn't want the headache of inconsistent management - this is a woeful and un-compelling reason to remove dog access that so many people and dogs have come to depend on and enjoy for their quality of life. Sometimes our jobs are difficult, but worthwhile to uphold the values we set out for ourselves.

Organization:

Commenter: Antonia Sivyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters believe that that tone of the SEIS contradicts the enabling legislation. While the enabling legislation identifies GGNRA as an area designated for open space recreation, but the SEIS states that visitors have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for recreation.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6391 **Comment Id:** 366068 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Furthermore, the SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that "In many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities." (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - "The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to ... expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

Organization:

Commenter: Jeffrey A Ubersax **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 3116 **Comment Id:** 351611 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Fry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1443 **Comment Id:** 352564 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I understand that the GGNRA's mission requires balancing the various values, but this SEIS does not give nearly enough weight to recreational values (such as dog walking), the main reason for the GGNRA's existence.

Organization: Montara Dog Group

Commenter: William R Bechtell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 632 **Comment Id:** 352775 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The document failed to provide substantial evidence to its claims that dog waste at Crissy Field is contributing to water quality issues. The document needs to provide localized monitoring and data to back up such claims, or else, if such data does not exist, it should remove the discussion of dog waste as an issue. Moreover, the document mischaracterized how much dog waste is left at Crissy Field; reading the document one has the impression that dog waste is left everywhere. I walk my dog weekly at Crissy Field and can attest that the grounds at Crissy Field are very clean and that dog owners who walk their dogs at Crissy Field are extremely responsible about picking up after their dogs. The document needs to more fairly characterize the amount of dog waste at Crissy Field, and therefore the issue of dog waste at Crissy Field.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Block **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4485 **Comment Id:** 353834 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

Organization:

Commenter: Tree Gelb Stuber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4704 **Comment Id:** 353843 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no

justification in the dog management plan for major changes.
Organization:
Commenter: Allison Oropallo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4946 **Comment Id:** 353872 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.
Organization:
Commenter: Anna Korolev **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5085 **Comment Id:** 353974 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: I fail to understand the rationale of these plans that would turn many ardent users of this treasure into adversaries of the NPS.
Organization:
Commenter: Jonathon Y Simmons **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5310 **Comment Id:** 354491 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.
Organization:
Commenter: ilia s gvozdenovic **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3994 **Comment Id:** 360389 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I've browsed the document, and the gist seems to be that GGNRA needs to have the same dog policy as other areas under NPS management. The issues cited in the "Need for Action" are cherry-picked to support the clear bias of this document.
Organization:
Commenter: Bjorn Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4733 **Comment Id:** 361410 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It seems to me that the purpose of the GGNRA is to establish parks, which are havens of the natural environment, relief from the urban, densely populated areas of the Bay Area. Unnecessary fences and restrictive leash laws undermine this purpose.
Organization:

Commenter: Janice A McIntosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4224 **Comment Id:** 362228 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The need for action related to litigation referred to on page 1 on the SEIS is largely a result of the GGNRA's own decision not to follow appropriate procedures. The conclusion that "The conflicts will likely escalate if not addressed .. " also on page 1 is not supported by experience or data.
Organization:
Commenter: G K Webb **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5889 **Comment Id:** 364520 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Consider, for example, the motivations as stated in the document for needing to take action. Basically it says the very differences for which GGNRA was formed cant really work anymore if it doesn't fit in the mold for NPS rules in general. It also states that sometimes problems occur in these GGNRA areas. As to the first motivation, why not acknowledge the existing anomaly in the NPS governing rules and be done with that motivating issue?
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5889 **Comment Id:** 364522 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As to the stated purpose of the GGNRA, I think it fine as is written. The problem with the proposal, which starts with a "solution" and then strives to justify a need (which it fails to do)is that the proposal also fails to recognize that national park experience is only a small part of that mission statement. More time needs to be spent rereading the second part of the statement and incorporating the servicing of those objectives in any plan.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6469 **Comment Id:** 367522 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The NPS does not demonstrate a need for action. The Plan argues for action because the parks resources and values "could be compromised" and speaks in ifs and mights but does not make a reasonable case for change.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367527 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I wish the GGNRA would take NEPA more seriously and produce an objective environmental analysis and follow the letter of the law. To date, that has not happened. In addition, I encourage the NPS/GGNRA to actively engage with relevant stakeholders to create a dog management plan what is workable and reasonable. NEPA encourages this type of dialogue and the NPS/GGNRA has flatly refused to collaborate with relevant stakeholders.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 599 **Comment Id:** 368345 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Document states the need for a clear and enforceable plan. NPS preferred alternative F, includes many differences based on area. Thats not very clear. Also, the NPS has already demonstrated enforceability problems now. How is changing to alternative F going to fix that? You still have the same resources; therefore alternative F does not meet this need.

Organization:

Commenter: Timothy Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/30/2014)

PN8000 Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action (Substantive)

1. Commenters stated that the management plan does not recognize dog walking as a valid recreation activity, instead dog walking is identified as creating impacts.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367998 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS objectives do not reflect, mention, or otherwise show any positive value of off-leash dog walking in the GGNRA. (13) Rather, your emphasis throughout the SEIS is to portray people and their pooches in relation to problems, issues and impacts. It has been noted elsewhere that the very word "recreation" is absent from your objectives, and absent too from your index. (14) This is a telling omission, for the value of recreation, the lodestone and basis of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, is only begrudgingly recognized in the SEIS. Recreation is a cultural resource, and is the most embedded, and indeed the eponymous park value in the GGNRA. Yet throughout the SEIS, recreation is posited as oppositional to environment, rather than being an integral component of environmental resources. Were you to embrace the values upon which the GGNRA was established, were you to work together with those for whom a walk in the GGNRA is the highlight of their day, then together we could ensure the thriving future of the GGNRA for all its visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters noticed that continuation of urban recreation is not included in the objectives of the plan. Urban recreation is, however, identified as an impact on other resources.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361997 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: While a keystone objective for the GGNRA is recreation, it does not appear at all in the plans objectives, nor is it referred to as one of the parks resources and values.

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4005 **Comment Id:** 368797 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Conservation of recreation is an essential GGNRA value that should not be impaired (see SDEIS inadequate discussion of impairment on pages 42-43). Certainly conservation of GGNRA's ecological integrity is a paramount mandate under the NPS organic act, but omitting urban recreation as an objective and as a park value that should be maintained improperly biases the planning and alternatives evaluation process. Instead, the SDEIS treats

GGNRA as victim of lack of recreational space in Bay Area (pages 21-22). As noted, the need for urban recreation area is one of the main reasons GGNRA was established in the first place (see GGNRA organic act quoted above and on page 43 of the SDEIS). This need for urban recreation is not an impact on GGNRA - it is one of GGNRA's fundamental purposes. This basic error permeates the SDEIS. Until recreation is considered an objective per the GGNRA organic act and legislative history, and an environmental value - - not simply an impact - - the supplemental draft EIS is biased both scientifically and politically. This bias results in a proposed plan that is far too restrictive in maintaining urban recreation for people and dogs in this unique national recreation area.

Organization:

Commenter: Kenneth S Weiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Commenters feel that several of the objectives will not be met by the management plan, such as consistent visitor experience throughout the park, minimizing conflicts involving dogs, and achieving a sufficient level of management. Some commenters questioned the objectives, specifically those on protecting cultural resources, maximizing education, and putting greatest emphasis on resources as opposed to human use.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5017 **Comment Id:** 362011 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Page 43 of the SEIS refers to "Management objectives in the draft 2011 General Management Plan that are relevant to dog management include the following: The park has significantly expanded in size and includes many new lands in San Mateo County. This planning process takes a comprehensive parkwide approach that will help ensure that the management of the natural and cultural resources and visitor experiences are consistent throughout all park areas." The SEIS does not meet this objective because Marin County and San Francisco County both have off-leash dog walking areas, while GGNRA's preferred alternatives for San Mateo County have none. Off-leash dog walking areas should be provided by GGNRA in San Mateo County as well as the other two counties.

Organization:

Commenter: Marilyn F Wacks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365500 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is an inherent conflict between "minimizing conflicts" and "including areas where dogs are allowed", and the report says nothing about how these conflicting goals are weighted or balanced. At present, the number of conflicts is exceedingly low (only 95 reports in 4 years, compared against 4.5 million incidents nationwide), and the present arrangement provides for a tremendous quantity of high-value experiences, as any visitor to the GGNRA can plainly see. The proposed plans will dramatically curtail experiences related to dog walking while providing no obvious reduction in the number of dog-attacks. Therefore, I do not believe that this objective is met by any of the new proposals, and is in fact, worsened by each of them.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365509 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The report cites as an objective "Protect cultural resources from the detrimental effects of dog use." I have read this entire report carefully, and found no reference to any "cultural resources" of any substantial value that are being degraded by dog use. This objective is not altered under any of the proposed plans, and is of no use in justifying any of the plans.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Under "Education", the report has an objective of "Build community support for the plan to maximize management of dog walking use." Exactly - The goal is to "maximize management". Who decided that the Goal of the NPS should be to MAXIMIZE MANAGEMENT of anything?
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6140 **Comment Id:** 365599 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I disagree that the goal of the NPS should be to absolutely minimize impacts without concern for public use. In the case of the GGNRA which is a public park situated in the middle of a dense urban population, the value of public use is MUCH HIGHER than in a remote park. The NPS wants to use exactly the same analysis on Crissy Field as it would use on a beach in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. However, it should be obvious that the potential benefits associated with public use at Crissy Field are immensely different than they would be on a remote beach in a wilderness. Therefore, a different analysis, based on the obviously different value opportunity, should be used.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6678 **Comment Id:** 369609 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The Park Service has presented several objectives, including providing a clear, enforceable dog management policy; preserving and protecting natural and cultural resources and natural processes; improving visitor safety; and reducing user conflicts.(1) However, the SEIS still does not achieve the level of management necessary for the Park Service to meet its stated objectives.
Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Commenter: Laura Horton **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 478 **Comment Id:** 351763 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The Plan Objectives seem to not address the needs of the Montara community who have successfully co-habited with wildlife and vegetation, while walking their dogs off leash on our beautiful trails.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4485 **Comment Id:** 353834 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

Organization:

Commenter: Tree Gelb Stuber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5085 **Comment Id:** 353974 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I fail to understand the rationale of these plans that would turn many ardent users of this treasure into adversaries of the NPS.

Organization:

Commenter: Jonathon Y Simmons **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4642 **Comment Id:** 361162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Use of specious arguments about regulations concerning dogs on Leash in national parks is an intentionally misleading representation about the regulatory process, the historic use of leash laws and the need to tailor regs to actual use and enjoyment.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Gropper-Nelson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4724 **Comment Id:** 361396 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The bias against one type of recreation (dogwalking) in a very densely populated region is absurd in relation to other types of recreational activity the National Park Service allows in other units including snowmobiling and off leash dogs for hunting purposes.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Finlay **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4297 **Comment Id:** 362362 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Why is "Recreation" not a stated objective? This plan is a biased farce and must be redone to have any credibility.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5889 **Comment Id:** 364522 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As to the stated purpose of the GGNRA, I think it fine as is written. The problem with the proposal, which starts with a "solution" and then strives to justify a need (which it fails to do)is that the proposal also fails to recognize that national park experience is only a small part of that mission statement. More time needs to be spent rereading the second part of the statement and incorporating the servicing of those objectives in any plan.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5889 **Comment Id:** 364524 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the document's stated objectives, I see much more of an objective to push consistent and narrow policies and much less of an objective to provide service in the form of access to local residents as they have chosen to use it traditionally.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6087 **Comment Id:** 365394 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the draft report, a section on Park Operations states that " Park staff, time, and money would be needed to manage any existing or future dog policies." While this statement is obviously true, it says nothing about the need for a change from the present dog management policy to a new dog management policy. The statement applies equally to both the present and the proposed policy.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365501 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In fact, the proposed policies are substantially less flexible than the present policy. Further, the proposals are being offered without any clear data indicating that the changes will deliver any of the supposed benefits, because of the absence of any of the data required to offer any such analyses - So, how are we to believe that implementation of a policy that is broadly applied elsewhere in the NPS will lead to "information gathering"? If information is not being gathered in any of the other 60 parks operated by the NPS, how will the addition of the

GGNRA to this structure suddenly lead to "information gathering"? Therefore, I do not believe that the proposed changes will meet this objective at all - in fact, the proposed changes will reduce flexibility and produce no new data - exactly the OPPOSITE of this objective.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365502 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In fact, each of the proposed alternatives will cost between $2M and $3M to implement, as compared to the $400K for present operations. Therefore, the proposed preferred alternatives will degrade park operations, requiring hiring of significantly more staff, and increase the costs of the entire operation. How can it be that the proposals are "improvements" if a clear consequence is that 5X MORE staff are required to operate under those proposals? Isn't the outcome expected by the NPS in its own reporting the EXACT OPPOSITE of this objective?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365506 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: the Natural resources objective is to reduce the detrimental effects of dogs on wildlife and natural vegetation. However, throughout the report, I find no evidence that shows that the present policies have produced any particular detrimental effects. There are many hypothetical statements, and plausible observations, but the plain truth is that the overwhelming majority of off-leash dog use in the GGNRA is on beaches or on planted lawn areas, where none of the detrimental effects are even possible.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365512 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Further, under Education, I see the goal of "Increase public understanding of NPS policies." So, regardless of the value or benefit of the policies, the NPS is offering to "increase public understanding" by imposing policies crafted for parks situated in remote wildernesses upon our urban GGNRA. Sure, by imposing inappropriate policies at the GGNRA, the NPS will be able to increase public awareness of these policies.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4005 **Comment Id:** 368796 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: INADEQUATE SCOPE AND FUNDAMENTAL BIAS IN SDEIS AND

ALTERNATIVES Under the NPS planning process and NEPA, the purpose and need, which is expressed by GGNRA's "Objectives" (page 2) drive the development and choice of alternatives, including monitoring and mitigation measures. Urban recreation should be one of those objectives. Surprisingly, while mentioned in the Purpose of GGNRA, the word "recreation" does not appear at all in the plan's Objectives (nor, also revealing, in the index of the SDEIS). The bias in the current draft could not be more stark than the omission of "recreation" as a keystone objective for the Golden Gate "National Recreation" Area. This omission stands in contrast to scoping - which is supposed to identify the scope of the plan and EIS - and where urban recreation needs were clearly identified (page 14). The phrase "park resources and values" is frequently mentioned, but does not refer to recreation as one of those resources and values. Likewise, the analysis of what is "environmentally-preferred" omits recreation as an environmental value. This omission also reflects the document's bias, despite decades of national environmental policy and Interior Department recognition of "recreation" as central to the meaning of "environmental quality." GGRNA itself was expressly established to provide and maintain recreation as a needed and essential part of the urban environment. The SDEIS contains many pages of purpose and need, objectives, regulatory history, and impacts at the outset of the draft document, but it is not until 43 pages later that the SDIES acknowledges the central role of recreation, when it finally quotes GGNRA's organic act: "GGNRA was established by Congress in 1972 (PL 92-589). The language of the enabling legislation states the park's purpose as follows: 'In order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas of Marin and San Francisco counties, California, possessing outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is hereby established.' " This should be the starting point for the development of the plan and the comparative evaluation of alternatives, not treated an historical footnote on page 43.

Organization:

Commenter: Kenneth S Weiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We would add as an aside at this point, objectives listed in this DEIS/SEIS were the desire to enhance Visitor experience and Safety, enhanced compliance with Dog Rules, and Park Operations. It should be evident from this point in GGNRA history, that the greatest obstacle to fulfilling these objectives was and still is GGNRA Management itself.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/30/2014)

PO1100 Comments Regarding Enforcement of Dog Walkers (Substantive)

1. **Current regulations regarding dogs should be enforced rather than new restrictions. Many commenters noted that a majority of dog owners are compliant, and enforcing the rules for the non-compliant dog walkers would be successful.**

Correspondence Id: 297 **Comment Id:** 350537 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The issues that NPS presents as problems with dogs in these areas is really an issue with a small minority of badly-behaved dogs and their owners. These issues can be easily remedied by requiring those offending dogs to be on a leash, or barring those particular dogs from the areas. This could easily be accomplished by having citizens report to the NPS staff - as they do now - which dogs and their owners are causing the problems. The answer is NOT draconian over-reach by the NPS to cause the majority of dogs and dog owners (tax payers) be disallowed their rights to public recreational lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Robert Leeper **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1436 **Comment Id:** 352552 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Enforcement should be reserved for the true bad apples who are unlikely to change their behavior regardless of regulations. The resources already expended for this process, and the resources that would potentially be required under the other options, can and should be allocated to more important issues. Allowing people to self regulate first, with enforcement a distant second, is always in society's best interests and is the higher calling of freedom.
Organization:
Commenter: Mark H **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1683 **Comment Id:** 353582 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: However, it is very disheartening that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is going to decrease off leash dog-friendly areas. The problems at hand are already illegal and you should enforce the laws that are currently in place instead of creating more rules.
Organization:
Commenter: Tara T **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2246 **Comment Id:** 356874 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The newly restrictive dog management plan makes no sense. If the problem is that people have not been adhering to the existing plan, the solution is to enforce the existing plan, not to make it even more restrictive. This only punishes the people who HAVE been following the plan, and those who flout them will simply continue doing so.

Organization:

Commenter: Teri R Hu **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2363 **Comment Id:** 358390 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The obvious solution to the problem, which annoys the majority of dog owners as well, is enforcement of the current rules. And let's not be naive about the power of rule-making to stop the improper conduct of this small majority- -they will simply break these new rules and run their dogs off leash regardless. The only way to stop them: enforcement. So seeing as how enforcement is the only way to stop the inconsiderate conduct that we all deplore, let's not punish the majority of dog owners who respect the rights of everyone to enjoy our natural environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael P Burns **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters expressed doubt or concern about the ability of the NPS to enforce the proposed restrictions. Many commenters noted that the enforcement of current regulations was inconsistent or not present. Commenters felt that NPS would not be able to enforce the rules proposed under the new dog management plan. Some commenters suggested that heavy-handed regulations, like those proposed in the DMP, would be difficult to enforce.**

Correspondence Id: 219 **Comment Id:** 350133 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Simply stating a trail is leash only does not make it so. It must be enforced. The NPS does not have the enforcement capacity now to enforce that rule. And the future strongly suggests that NPS capacity will be cut rather than enhanced. As a consequence, stating a leash only rule has the effect of allowing unleashed dogs on trails in many instances.

Organization:

Commenter: Roger D Harris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 362 **Comment Id:** 351163 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Given these points and the strong desire by dog walkers and the community to continue to use these trails, I suggest that it may be difficult for GGNRA and the NPS Rangers to effectively enforce the Alternatives.

Organization: San Mateo County Government Center, District 3

Commenter: Don Horsley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1400 **Comment Id:** 352445 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And in my 13 years of frequenting Mori Point, I have yet to see one enforcement officer, hence the low number of reported incidents in the most recent report. If there are not enough resources to enforce on-leash and excrement pick-up policies, the proposed alternative of on-leash is useless. We are back to the status quo of lack of safety, damaged ecology for the animals that do belong in the area, as well as the unhygienic waste ubiquitous to Mori Point.
Organization:
Commenter: Summer Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3938 **Comment Id:** 360095 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Both will require a new level of management by NPS which even now does not really exist with regard to trails or access paths to the beach. There is essentially no enforcement now of the leash rules. Vehicle-based enforcement will not be adequate for any of the alternatives
Organization:
Commenter: DAVID M MACKENZIE **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. **Commenters expressed strongly that the new regulations would only be successful with strong enforcement. Many commenters noted a desire or hope that these regulations would be well enforced.**

Correspondence Id: 648 **Comment Id:** 352816 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am in support of the NPS preferred alternative for Ocean Beach, but I would like to stress the importance of enforcing the law. Without enforcement there is no law, and that is the current state of Ocean Beach. I have walked the full length of Ocean Beach 72 times over the past year. I observed egregious amounts of non-compliance with the current laws, and I have never once seen a Park Ranger doing anything about it. Any changes in the law will be purely symbolic unless they are actually enforced. Whether the current laws stay in place, or the preferred alternative is initiated, I urge the NPS to actually enforce the laws to protect natural resources and visitor experience.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 683 **Comment Id:** 352936 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE PROBLEM? How will any regulations/rules be enforced? I walk in the GGNRA nearly every day and see dogs off-leash that exhibit both positive and negative behaviors. I've only encountered rangers once or twice in over 6-8 months. As usual, it's the small minority of irresponsibles that makes it difficult for the rest. Once rules are established and agreed upon, there needs to be strict and consequential enforcement and penalties. Please spend the time and effort to devise a way (ways?) to address this issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Ron Welf **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2746 **Comment Id:** 357173 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I hope that the regulations will be enforced when adopted: there are, alas, some dog owners who do not feel bound by regulations which they perceive as infringement on their dogs' entitlement to full freedom

Organization:

Commenter: Ellen @ Barth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3333 **Comment Id:** 358162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly urge park officials to enforce regulations concerning dogs in the GGNRA more consistently and forcefully.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrew C Rush **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3834 **Comment Id:** 359953 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Enforcement Policy The policies must be vigorously enforced; otherwise this initiative is doomed to fail. Must make it clear how enforced. The only way to effectively enforce issued citations is to have the rules state that by using the park, dog owners accept the rules and responsibilities, and enforcement procedures. Appropriate staff must be provided and tasked to enforce these rules at all times. Either existing staff or new dedicated staff needs to be hired to patrol and enforce these areas. Enforcement fines should be easily enough to cover the associated personnel expenses.

Organization:

Commenter: John Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4722 **Comment Id:** 361389 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Most importantly, whatever mix of restrictions are implemented, I urge you to vigorously enforce the new regulations by issuing citations from Day 1. Many dog owners are proud scofflaws. Enforcement is the only way for the new regulations to be successful. Please

install clear signage at trailheads and beach access that clearly states "Dogs on-leash only. Citations issued. No warnings given." Robust enforcement, issuing citations, not warnings, is the only way that the new regulations will be followed. Please issue citations to violators.

Organization:

Commenter: Kevin S Stockmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5181 **Comment Id:** 362505 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: All rules, regulations, policies, and directives are useless unless they are enforced, by committed enforcement personnel who have the equipment, personnel, and support of their actions by the agency and legal system. Empower the right authorized personnel with the tools and support to do the job and the issues that have last over numerous years would become a moot issue.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366294 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Leash requirements must be strictly enforced throughout the life of the policy. Otherwise proposed on-leash areas will become de facto off-leash areas, as has already happened under the old rules. Any DMP or EIS Alternative must also include funding for thorough enforcement. As it is, dog owners recognize that there is little chance that they will encounter a law enforcement ranger, so they readily let their dogs off-leash and/or take their dogs into closed areas without fear of negative repercussions.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368120 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Enforcement: All established Dog Management Rules must be strictly and uniformly enforced at all times ' no more exceptions, no more "education," no more "warnings," no more excuses. Signage must reflect with words, maps, and other illustrations the consequences of non-compliance. Fines for violations of "POSTED RULES" holds more monetary weight than a fine for a dog "unleashed;" enforcement officers must opt for the highest possible monetary fine in order to solidify the overwhelming need to compel dog owners that the public demands their compliance versus continuing to all their perceived entitlement of being an exception to the Laws and certainty that officers will continue to not hold them accountable.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

4. **Commenters made suggestions about enforcement of the new regulations. Some suggestions included not using mounted police in off-leash dog areas, more ranger training and education, using random checks to issue citations, a citation reporting system for the public to report offenders, a loose enforcement of rules with tickets as a last resort, and a system to report rangers who acted inappropriately towards dog owners.**

Correspondence Id: 26 **Comment Id:** 337985 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In referenced to unleashed areas in federal parks- Any area that allows dogs to be unleashed should not be patrolled by mounted park police officers. It is an accident waiting to happen to allow horses in parks designated for unleashed dogs AND dogs to be under voice control. For everyones safety,including dogs,people,mounted officers & horses,KEEP horses OUT of the parks where you allow off leashed dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Liz D Newman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 80 **Comment Id:** 339913 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: GGNRA rules should also provide penalties for overzealous enforcement by park rangers or other government employees who may be tempted to engage in petty power trips when dealing with members of the public. These penalties should be *heavier* than any imposed on dog owners for violations of the rules, since government employees are entrusted by the public with special authorities and responsibilities and therefore must be held to higher standards. When someone files a complaint regarding a particular employee, there should be an investigation into the behavior described in the complaint, and the person who filed the complaint should be informed as to how that investigation was conducted, what penalties were imposed or corrective actions taken if any, and how to further appeal the issue if desired. Too many individuals in positions of authority think that wearing a uniform or having a shiny badge gives them carte blanche to order people around, take on an arrogant attitude, or refuse to answer legitimate questions. Public servants should act like public *servants*, and if they are unable to do their jobs with an appropriately humble and service-oriented attitude, then they should be sent to remedial sensitivity training or removed from their positions. Complaint procedures should also be clear, simple, and transparent to media and members of the public. Complaint forms should be available on-site, and should also be public. No one should have to rely on simply taking the word of a government employee when asking questions such as what opinions have been voiced by members of the public with regard to a specific policy <redacted> they should be given free access to view, copy, listen to, etc., the original documents, emails, voicemail messages, etc.

Organization: Libertarian Party of San Francisco

Commenter: Starchild N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1179 **Comment Id:** 351920 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We would hope that you would instruct officers to talk to offenders and only issue tickets as a last resort to repeat offenders. Signage needs to indicate an enforceable standard for "voice control" such as 30 or 60 seconds. If the NPS wants the off leash area to be successful for us dog owners I would hope that tickets would only be issued on very rare occasions and the rules be loosely enforced, especially at the Central Beach and early mornings or late afternoons at the East Beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Bill and Ursula Moffett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1493 **Comment Id:** 352909 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Just like the CHP puts out sobriety checkpoints, I would love to see rangers do regular, unannounced citations of off leash dog walkers. Let the word get around that one will get cited for breaking the rules

Organization:

Commenter: Mike N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1916 **Comment Id:** 354542 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: How about signs at the trails with a number to call and report bad behavior? How about rangers doing spot checks for bad behavior? Rather than poop on the hundreds of responsible park users and their dogs, how about rangers and deputies investigate and respond to calls and reports on a case by case basis of bad behavior rather than spend their time scouting for random violations of leash law that weren't reported by a complainant?

Organization:

Commenter: Jean M Bready **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2401 **Comment Id:** 358897 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: However and more important, stronger compliance should be a high priority when it comes to off-leach areas for dogs that are not under voice command. Pets that run free, that do not respond to owners voice commands should cited and multiple violation should come with an eventual banishment from open space in GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Will Mosgrove **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5151 **Comment Id:** 362282 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A simple and effective violation reporting system should be established. The dog management plan should include a method by which park visitors can easily and effectively report non-compliant behavior. Perhaps a smart phone app that directly connects to the Park

Police or to a reporting system could be devised. At a minimum signs could be posted at entrance points, (ie., Ocean Beach) with a phone number to call and report forms/information.

Organization: International Urban Estuary Network/Save the Bay

Commenter: Arlene Gemmill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. The areas that should be allowed for off-leash dog walking should reflect the actual ability of the NPS to enforce regulations.

Correspondence Id: 110 **Comment Id:** 345825 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to see more areas allowed for people to walk their dogs, not doubt more areas than what you have proposed. But, only with a very strong enforcement to go along with it. I suspect that the shrinking areas you are proposing has to do with the real world costs and problems of enforcement. In the end, if you do not have the person power to properly enforce whatever you do, then shrink the areas to match the person power you have to vigorously enforce your rules.

Organization: None

Commenter: James Douglas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1153 **Comment Id:** 351780 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I regularly hike GGNRA trails around Tennessee Valley and Mill Valley. In the past year or so the increase in the number of people on the trails with dogs off leash is tremendous. I see 5 to 20 of them on almost every hike I take. All the trails I hike are either completely off limits to dogs or the dogs must be on a leash. I have pointed this out to dog owners many times, and not a single one has put their dog on the leash as a result of "learning" that their dog is required to be on a leash. Many times the owners feign ignorance or treat me as if I'm doing something wrong by pointing out their disregard of the regulations. I've called dog dispatch a few times, but they never seem to be available to come give out citations. If there isn't any way to enforce the current leash regulations then no dogs should be permitted on the trails at all.

Organization:

Commenter: Roberta Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3187 **Comment Id:** 357959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Instead of shrinking areas where people can let their dogs off-leash, you need to staff those areas so people who don't have control of their dogs are ticketed. Yes, ticketed. The revenues from ticketing would more than pay for the additional personnel.

Organization:

Commenter: Martha L Austen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4932 **Comment Id:** 361793 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Having witnessed countless violations of posted NPS policies and flagrant disregard for the park environment by dog owners, it is most imperative that the NPS not only implement a strong Dog Management Plan, but also ensure appropriate resources for its monitoring and enforcement.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard Bradus **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

6. **Commenters related experiences from the park in which enforcement of regulations was not sufficient; many commenters felt that more rangers should be present in the park.**

Correspondence Id: 2442 **Comment Id:** 358940 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: On the way back from the hike I stopped to chat with a Park Police officer to inquire about the leash laws. I just wanted to know. He seemed shaken and told me that one part of Baker Beach is off leash and the other is no dogs and that the Presidio is always leash only. The young officer then shared with me that there is an unspoken agreement NOT to enforce leash laws because of the bullying of dog owners. He said they gang up and personally attack him, report him, and accuse him of horrible things that tie him up on court on his off time and that he was frankly powerless to enforce the law. This is unacceptable. No demographic should be allowed to intimidate rangers, peace officers or other hikers, not ever. The park services are always short on funding. Enforcing the leash and no dog areas laws would not only send a clear message to dog owners where and where not to exercise dog privileges, but raise revenue for education, signs and other important programs. Those who scoff the law should be ticketed, fined and people bullying the law should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.
Organization:
Commenter: D C Spensley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5200 **Comment Id:** 362591 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As recently as this afternoon, I observed 2 hikers in a county park in Marin County on a leash-only trail with a large dog off leash. When another dog walker warned them that a ranger was ticketing hikers for off-leash dogs ahead, they (with much shouting at the dog before they could get it to come to them) leashed it. Once they'd passed the ranger on the trail (we were walking a short distance behind them) and he was out of sight, off came the leash. Only consistent enforcement with fines large enough to be a deterrent will bring these folk to heel.
Organization:
Commenter: Trent W Orr **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5231 **Comment Id:** 362740 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, the irresponsible owners know that there are insufficient enforcement resources and that the probability of enforcement action is very remote. Given inadequate resources and the commonly stated view that the irresponsible owners are a distinct minority, it is surprising that I have never seen a dog owner step in when a dog owner or other person's dog is misbehaving. Given the inadequate resources for enforcement of dog regulations, other people are on their own to deal with whatever comes up.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Sprinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are a high percentage of non-compliant dog owners and professional dog walkers who provide false information or are rude and verbally abusive to the U.S. Park Officers. We are saddened to read about these incidents but not surprised based on our own experiences with non-compliant dog owners in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5648 **Comment Id:** 364068 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Voice control" is a euphemism for "no control" and unless GGNRA has insufficient funding to provide ranger services during the day, these abuses will continue. Currently, there are typically no rangers present even on popular beaches on sunny weekend days - this past weekend on Rodeo Beach, for example, between 10 and 1 pm, not a ranger seen, and many loose dogs running roughshod over sunbathers, picnickers, and small children. When conftonted dog owners are hostile and argumentative and deny any responsibility for their animals' behavior. I have been told at Crissy Field that this is a "dog beach" and children are not welcome (my son was trampled to the point of screaming because a dog wanted his sandwich).

Organization:

Commenter: Liza Wozniak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368428 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is also no discussion about the lack of systematic enforcement of dog-related regulations in GGNRA and how the lack of systematic enforcement biases the dog related incident data. My review of documents obtained through a FOIA request by CBD in 2004 and Wild Equity in 2001 suggested that GGNRA never had a systematic professional management plan for enforcing dog-related regulations and protecting public safety, natural resources, and the quality of visitor experience. The GGNRA response to complaints about off-leash dog behavior in those documents and personally to me from former Supervisor ONeill elicited this type of

response: Call law enforcement when you see a violation! Yet, as I discussed in my comments to the firstEIS draft, informing GGNRA dispatch about a dog-related incident rarely, if ever, results in mitigation of the incident or citation for a violation.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

7. **Commenters felt that the dog walking community is successful at enforcing the current regulations. The use of more signage or education about the existing regulations would further help this community self-regulate.**

Correspondence Id: 489 **Comment Id:** 351785 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Better posting of existing regulations is all that's needed to educate visitors with dogs and overwhelmingly responsible vast majority of dog owners will happily assist in politely enforcing the rules.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Erlichman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 568 **Comment Id:** 352651 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If there are concerns about enforcement of existing policies, then a reasonable first step is to make sure those policies are clearly communicated. I have been very confused about which areas of Ft. Funston are considered "off path" for humans (who are heavier and more disruptive to their environment than any almost any other animal). If there are concerns about protecting the park, then enforcement of existing restrictions is a reasonable first step. Instead of spending money on a plan, the GGNRA could be making money by fining violators to existing restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Jessica Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1807 **Comment Id:** 354121 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Rules are needed, not exclusions, and the dog-owner community is exceptional in its enforcement of responsible behavior among itself.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen A Waxman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5312 **Comment Id:** 362950 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In all that time and on all those occasions there have been very few encounters (I can count them on the fingers of one hand) with other park users who have problems with off

leash dogs. Instead all the different types of folks I've encountered on the trail seem to have learned to get along with one another, especially after it became evident that, due to funding cuts everywhere, there's no authority figure they can run to with their problems

Organization:

Commenter: Jim W Stockinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6040 **Comment Id:** 365019 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my time as a Dog Walker I've NEVER had a problem with another dog or their walker, in fact just the opposite - I feel overall we police the area ourselves very well & in no way do I feel $2,000,000 should be used in support of more rangers. There are certainly many other areas that would benefit from those funds like MORE parking!

Organization:

Commenter: hannah j st. martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367540 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It would be helpful if the GGNRA would place signs about where people can walk their dogs under the 1979 Pet Policy now so everyone can understand the boundaries. This would also give the US Park Police and NPS Park Rangers an idea about where to enforce or not on GGNRA lands. These immediate possible mitigation measures should be given a chance to work before the GGNRA implements any significant restrictions as are proposed in the DSEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

8. Some commenters expressed that they would continue to be non-compliant to new regulations; these commenters stated that they would resist and attempt at enforcement of the regulations despite the consequences.

Correspondence Id: 7 **Comment Id:** 337960 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Currently there is a leash requirement, yet there are off leash dogs running free in that area all of the time. If your team isn't able to enforce the leash laws, how do you expect to enforce the ban - especially with hundreds of angry protesters showing up with their dogs just to show you we won't let you take our beach from us.

Organization:

Commenter: Thomas C Jagger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1332 **Comment Id:** 352333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is little if any enforcement of the leash law, dog walkers violate rules far more consistently than they follow them. The sense of entitlement among dog owners is truly stunning. I do not feel safe, nor do any of my friends with children.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1459 **Comment Id:** 352817 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Just because you walk a dog off lease doesn't mean you're subject to stop & seziure... what that means is I HAVE EVERY RIGHT TO WITHHOLD NAME & ADDRESS if I get confronted by a ranger... so how do you plan to enforce it?

Organization:

Commenter: Harrison Westwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5198 **Comment Id:** 362575 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: You know what if you continue these leash laws/ no dogs allowed, perhaps we could still go to those no dogs allowed and let are dogs go off leash going against the leash laws. If rangers come we will refuse to obey just like Rosa Parks did on that buss in 1958.

Organization:

Commenter: Ryan P Witwicki Faddegon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5205 **Comment Id:** 362599 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you pass this we will continue to walk our dogs. The rangers who will be ticketing will be foreigners on our land. College grads from Michigan etc. This is not right. You will have to ticket, taze, arrest on repeat because we will continue our life style.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristin A Van Til **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6536 **Comment Id:** 368844 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The policy changes will be very difficult to enforce. Some civil disobedience is likely.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5224 **Comment Id:** 362693 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Packing off-leash recreation into small spaces will create unpleasant, crowded

"dog runs." Many people, me included, will simply stop going to legal off-leash areas. Will people simply stop walking their dog off-leash? Some may, but many others will probably crowd into city parks. And some will simply walk in areas of the GGNRA where they are not likely to encounter a ranger/citation.

Organization:

Commenter: K Hu **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

9. The proposed regulations would require an increased cost for adequate enforcement. Some commenters felt that this was not addressed. Other commenters stated that the record of incidents did not necessitate a change in policy, or the need for more rangers or enforcement.

Correspondence Id: 1919 **Comment Id:** 354554 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The notion that increasing regulations won't lead to increased enforcement costs is obviously flawed. Restrictions are meaningless if not enforced and that takes ranger hours and money. I imagine it would take a lot of money to keep a resident of muir beach from taking their dog onto the beach or the coastal trail.

Organization:

Commenter: David V Gainer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2943 **Comment Id:** 355250 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not to mention enforcing will be impossible given current funding.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Rowan paul **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4689 **Comment Id:** 361339 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, data shows dogs are not causing problems at the parks. Last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Siobhan Quinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365368 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The request for $2,000,000 for more rangers to implement the dog management

plan would be much better spent on simply enforcing the existing 1979 Pet Policy and on new educational and dog-friendly park programs, as well as supporting the existing infrastructure used by all park visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6155 **Comment Id:** 365652 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Enforcement of the existing policy will be far more economical (instead of the $2 million dollars requested to implement the proposed Dog Management Plan) as well as solving any problems currently perceived or existing.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim M **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

10. Some commenters expressed concern that the SEIS did not present enough detail on the enforcement of the proposed regulations.

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365547 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Enforcement not Adequately Addressed Enforcement is key to successful implementation, to compliance and to protection of wildlife and habitats. Too many people seem to feel that they will never get caught, don't care, or feel that they are somehow different and entitled to behave as they wish. The description of the enforcement program or management activities is vague and leaves many components poorly defined. There should be a more comprehensive description of the planned enforcement program. What are the anticipated threshold levels for implementing management actions and would they differ among sites? What thresholds or triggers would be used to decide when to take enforcement actions management actions such as to close a trail? What specific enforcement actions would be initiated, besides issuing warrants to violators and or closing trails, and for what non-compliance activities would they be initiated? GGNRA is in the process of developing a warrant process. Information should be provided about the warrants: how they would be issued; for what infractions; how many times would offenses have to be repeated before warrants would be issued?

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

11. Commenters felt that the impacts analysis was inadequate because it did not consider the impacts of the current conditions (alternative A) with enforcement when comparing it to the preferred alternative, which has assumed enforcement and compliance. Additionally, one commenter mentioned that the impact analysis should consider the impact of lack of enforcement in the action alternatives, given the current inability of NPS to provide adequate enforcement.

Correspondence Id: 3100 **Comment Id:** 357903 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed ban on dogs at Ocean Beach between Stairwell 21 and Sloat Blvd is inappropriate and unjustified. The NPS is proposing a complete ban on dogs without considering enforcing the current on-leash policy. In fact, the impacts analysis section of the document compares the impacts of the current on-leash policy with little-to-no enforcement to the preferred alternative of a dog ban with enforcement. To truly compare the impacts of an on-leash policy at Ocean Beach versus a ban on dogs, the NPS would need to compare both scenarios with similar levels of enforcement.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357935 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS compared on-leash impact with non-compliance in the SPPA to no dogs assuming compliance; however, the SEIS did not provide any justification for the assumption that enforcement of a no-dog policy in the SPPA would have any better rate of compliance. The GGNRA would need to compare a no-dog policy with non-compliance to an on-leash dog policy with non-compliance in order to justify any claim of a beneficial impact. If the GGNRA intends to enforce a no-dog policy in the SPPA then it would need to compare a no-dog policy with enforcement and compliance to an on-leash dog policy with enforcement and compliance.

Organization:

Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4118 **Comment Id:** 362041 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Second, without effective enforcement, none of the Alternatives will be successful. The SEIS is silent on the current level of ineffective enforcement, and on any plans for increased and truly effective enforcement of current dog use regulations. This is a critical flaw of the SEIS, because like the issue of "voice control", the Alternatives are purely theoretical in intended outcome if not backed up by effective enforcement. I urge the NPS to not be silent on this practical disconnect. The best Alternatives will be greatly diminished in their intended outcome without effective enforcement. To advance an Alternative under NEPA, but not have practical supporting actions by the responsible federal agency to make the intended outcomes reasonably achievable, is flawed policy making at best.

Organization:

Commenter: greg norby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 3 **Comment Id:** 337954 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If there are problems with out of control dogs (I have seen very few the past five years, and none that resulted in any injury or damage) then step up enforcement of existing regulations.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel M Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6 **Comment Id:** 337959 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: All of this is going on RIGHT NOW, with rules being violated according to the CURRENT PLAN. When I have told your officers as well as supervisors about these violations, they have been ignored. On one occasion, two of your officers were sitting in their vehicle in the parking lot of Ocean Beach, and I informed them that there were five dogs just over the sand dunes that were off leash in an on leash area. They basically ignored me, and when I asked them if they were going to do their job, one of your officers threatened me with being cited for some bogus violation. In a conversation I had with one of your supervisors, I was told that "it's a resource problem, we don't have the officers to patrol the beach for dog violations." Yet you have tons of officers to harass local people who are having fires at night, enjoying the beach and minding their own business. Your priorities are off, in my view. In this draft proposal for a new "dog management plan", I don't see any provision for adding "more resources" i.e. more officers to enforce your regulations. Did I miss it somewhere? Without that, how will you be able to enforce a new plan any better than you been able to enforce the current plan?

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Hill N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 337969 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am completly against any of the options for Fort Funston except Alternative A. The draconian "alternatives" you have laid out are simply unacceptable, unwarrated, unwanted, and wasteful. Enforceent would be futile and expensive leading to misgivings between the patrons and the Park service. This semi remote area is unique and precious the way it is - don't attempt to ruin it and cause un-necessary stress on the Park service and the population it is supposed to serve.

Organization:

Commenter: Bart Beeman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 14 **Comment Id:** 337971 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Unless the NPS enforces the dog rules, many of the dog owners allow their pets to spoil the experience for the visitors, environment, and wildlife. 36 CFR Â§ 2.15 - The sections

GGNRA160558

of the NPS pet regulation that prohibit: -Failing to dispose of pet excrement *nice word for raw sewage left on our park jewels* 36 CFR Â§ 2.1 - The regulation to preserve natural, cultural and archeological resources which prohibits possessing, destroying, injuring, defacing, removing, digging or disturbing wildlife, fish, plants or cultural or archeological resources. 36 CFR Â§ 2.2 - The regulation to protect wildlife that prohibits the feeding, touching, teasing, frightening or intentional disturbing of wildlife nesting, breeding or other activities. 36 CFR Â§ 2.34(a)(4) - The regulation regarding disorderly conduct which prohibits creating hazardous or physically offensive conditions.

Organization:

Commenter: l. ru **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 23 **Comment Id:** 337982 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I'm wondering how GGNRA will enforce the voice command requirements. Lots of dog owners think that if a dog saunters over after they holler it's name 8 times, they think that counts as voice control. I support leashed dog walking areas, but, many dog owners have their pets on very long leashes that block the trails and still allow the dogs to jump on passing walkers. Perhaps there should be some guidance on how to use the leash or how to control the dog? It should be prohibited to allow a dog to jump on a stranger, whether the dog is on or off a leash. It should be prohibited for a dog to harass wildlife or go off trail, whether it's on or off a leash. Please do aggressively enforce any rules. I live in an area where no one enforces the dog leash laws, and it just seems over run with unruly dog owners and their well-meaning but untrained pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Kossy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 40 **Comment Id:** 338006 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am so appreciative of the efforts of the GGNRA to create a multi-use park for all to enjoy, not just a park dogs and dog walkers. While I would personally like to see all of the GGNRA be completely dog free (no dogs allowed not even on leash), I support the current preferred alternative. As it is now, my children do not have enough space to play without interference by some off leash dog and the risk of dog bites. I would like to see strict enforcement of the new rules to protect my children and other visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 346268 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I fully support the measures outlined in this document. I support the GGNRA plan, and I FULLY SUPPORT INCREASED ENFORCEMENT OF ON-LEASH LAWS

Organization:

Commenter: A Sojourner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 152 **Comment Id:** 347146 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SF has many parks, but even when dogs are required to be on-leash or are not allowed, the rules are not enforced and dogs are present off-leash. GGRA should not consider this problem separately. In reality, it offers the only opportunity for people to enjoy parks without dogs in SF. Enforcement of dog restrictions should be consistent and robust. "Under voice control" doesn't work . I don't speak to dog owners anymore because some of them are rude and aggressive and I am afraid.
Organization:
Commenter: Maggie McElroy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 157 **Comment Id:** 349899 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Most dog owners take the time to train their dogs and clean up after them; they should not be punished for the behaviors of the minority. Irresponsible dog owners could be ticketed or banned from the GGNRA. This should certainly include owners who allow their dogs to chase or otherwise harass wildlife.
Organization:
Commenter: Deborah S Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 215 **Comment Id:** 350127 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dog owners in general are good at picking up their own and their dog's mess. If this is such a problem, why does the GGNRA not hire 1 or even 2 park rangers? All of the times I have been to the park, I have not seen one. They should enforce the rules to both dog owners and non-dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: John Nguyen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 258 **Comment Id:** 350373 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Finally, the Crissy Field alternative where you divide the field into ROLA and on-leash is going to be VERY hard to control. Will there be a fence to delineate the area? I completely agree that East Beach should now be on-leash since so many families with kids come there in nice weather, but the field should not be split in half. I believe that alternative E is fair for everyone.
Organization:
Commenter: Christine C Garward **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 273 **Comment Id:** 350450 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I predict that the revised plan will fail for the following reasons: You don't have the enforcement ability to gain compliance, the majority (albeit a narrow one) both opposes the plan, most important and IT'S OUR PARK TOO, so we will overcome a tyrannical effort by a top heavy, bureaucratic, inefficient agency such as yours to impose a minority view to ban dogs from GGNRA

Organization:

Commenter: dane faber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 353 **Comment Id:** 350700 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If dogs aren't under voice control fine the owners, if dogs aren't on leash but should be- fine the owners, and most importantly if an owner doesn't pick up after their dog- FINE the owner. With this approach either you wouldn't have any work to do and there would be no more staff needed, or more likely, at least initially, there would be steady income to support the salaries of the staff you need to enforce.

Organization:

Commenter: Chris Holland **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 354 **Comment Id:** 350858 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There is almost no monitoring of off leash activity by the Park Rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 446 **Comment Id:** 351382 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: GGNRA Rangers are not properly trained to enforce this. Hence the TASER of a dog walker in San Mateo

Organization:

Commenter: Tom Jagger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1025 **Comment Id:** 351448 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am concerned that the Draft Management Plan does not adequately address the problems created by the rapid growth in dog walking within the GGNRA. This is particularly a problem at Ocean Beach where dogs interfere with the nesting Snowy Plover. Simply requiring dog owners to keep their dogs on leash will be ineffective without enforcement. Dog owners already routinely ignore leash requirements because of inadequate enforcement. Without increased enforcement they will also ignore leash requirements at the Snowy Plover habitat.

Organization:
Commenter: Joseph Majer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1049 **Comment Id:** 351486 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This will only work if rangers are out there to issue tickets for abusers. I never see them out in Marin....never, and I am there once every two weeks. Dog owners disregard rules if no one is out there to enforce them.
Organization:
Commenter: S Polk **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1068 **Comment Id:** 351521 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I feel that then pro dog walkers who use our parks should be closely monitored and that part of their business taxes should benefit the park systems. I also feel that the pro dog walkers should be fined if they are abusing the system. Regular dog walkers, dog owners should also be warned and then fined for violations.
Organization:
Commenter: Chrisitna Braun **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1081 **Comment Id:** 351533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Follow National Park rules: dogs are on leash. I have been told that even in Southern California on the beaches, police really do police the areas and KEEP people keep their dogs on leash. We have spent far too much time and resources pandering to these people. Put down the rules, AND MORE IMPORTANTLY, ENFORCE with fines. That seems an excellent way to add to the financial resources of parks while protecting and enhancing our parks.
Organization:
Commenter: John Fiore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1088 **Comment Id:** 351540 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm not sure what the NPS can do about enforcing the leash laws. I have hiked with dog walking friends who are otherwise law abiding people who take off the leash when they deem it safe (from a ticket) and make a point of warning other dog owners if they've seen a park service employee. But I do hope that they continue to recognize the negative impacts and restrict dog access.
Organization:
Commenter: Carol Haggerty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1118 **Comment Id:** 351668 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Regarding off-leash access, the document references conflicts an wanting to reduce conflicts by banning dogs. That would certainly reduce the possibility of this type of conflict, but reducing liberties for all because there are a few people causing conflicts is always the wrong solution. It would be fare more equitable to hold the people causing conflicts to be responsible for those conflicts. Increase fine for owners of aggressive dogs who are not able to control them. But don't punish the owners of well behaved dogs who are under full voice control?

Organization:

Commenter: Len Schultz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 471 **Comment Id:** 351753 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If the areas are clearly marked with appropriate signs there will definitely be more compliance. I know whichareas we are allowed on leash which makes me assume all other areas are safe to be off leash. I would be very angry to receive a ticket/fine in one of these many confusing unmarked trails.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 488 **Comment Id:** 351775 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The law enforcement incident reports from 2008 through 2011 showed that there were 729 incidents reported for having a dog off leash within the Ocean Beach SPPA during the period (July 1 through May15) when dogs must be leashed. 1. This same data (Appendix G) shows the incidents of disturbing wildlife is very low or non-existent, most of the violations are related to leash law. 2. This same data (Appendix G) shows decreasing number of dog incidents from 2001-2006 before the new leash law 36 CFR 1.5, and then decreasing again From 2007-2011 after the new leash law 36 CFR 1.5 3. If compliance to current law is poor, why do think a ban of dogs altogether will be well complied with? Most people are very used to walking there dogs there now and will probably continue to do so since there are no other open space alternatives in the area The document identifies SPPA as a moderate dog walking area. If thats that case than monitoring and citations could be used to enforce the leash laws.

Organization:

Commenter: Tim Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1159 **Comment Id:** 351792 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Ranger also mentioned the proposed rules were necessary since lots of people were violating the current law. Then why not just ENFORCE the current law? If you don't have the resources to do so, you won't have them under the new law either. So, the

reasoning that it is easier to enforce the preferred alternative is not true.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 504 **Comment Id:** 351827 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The point of this story is that these new dog management rules- -which stipulate, for instance, that dogs must be on-leash on trail A, but can be off-leash on the south end of the beach, but cannot set foot on trail C- -will only frustrate dog owners and the already overextended rangers who will be charged with enforcing the new rules in addition to their other important duties. It would be much better to designate certain particularly fragile areas as off-limits to all dogs (as in the current policy) than it would be to negotiate the fine lines of the particular spaces where dogs are allowed under particular conditions (as in the various Alternative policies).

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1201 **Comment Id:** 351965 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe the strong desire by dog walkers and the community to continue the traditional use of these areas for recreation of their pets will make it difficult for GGNRA and the NPS Rangers to effectively enforce the Alternatives

Organization: San Mateo County Supervisor District 5

Commenter: Adrienne J Tissier **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1202 **Comment Id:** 351968 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am very glad that dogs will now be leashed on most GGNRA public beaches. It is disturbing to have dogs running and fighting and peeing while families are trying to picnic and relax. But good luck enforcing the rule!!

Organization:

Commenter: Dee Soul **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1254 **Comment Id:** 352178 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGNRA gate on Lattie is over run by professional dog walkers who park illegally and leave a mess behind. Yesterday as one with 6 unleashed dogs was leaving another with 5 was coming. Do the Rangers ever patrol here?

Organization:

Commenter: ROBT L FREITAS **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1271 **Comment Id:** 352206 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Expect civil disobedience and total non compliance with any new regulations and any laws you fools impose on our beach access.
Organization:
Commenter: A Pewarson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1321 **Comment Id:** 352303 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: At in-person meetings when all of this movement began, I was told the sole reason for these changes was to ease the rangers' ability to enforce regulations; I was also told that no one had reported serious issues with the current status of trail usage.
Organization:
Commenter: Christine Stuart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1321 **Comment Id:** 352307 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Oh, and by the way, we all know it's completely unlikely that you have the money and manpower to enforce whatever you decide to impose on us; you are simply losing our respect through this continued effort to threaten us with deprivation of reasonable rights to use these incredible outdoor places.
Organization:
Commenter: Christine Stuart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1337 **Comment Id:** 352345 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Once there are NO legal, accessible trails (except areas to far away to access), when it is time to walk the dog, people will be walking the dog illegally on any trail they walk on. There is then no incentive at all for the public to remain only on the specific dog-trails. I fear that some of the NPS proposals will result in problems, and the local public will be ill-served.
Organization:
Commenter: brian Spring **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1353 **Comment Id:** 352387 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have reviewed your draft proposal for a "Dog Management Plan". It seems like a policy designed to cover up your own mismanagement. That's because you already don't enforce the CURRENT plan that you have. At Ocean Beach, where I live, huge numbers of dogs run off leash in the on leash areas on a daily basis. The last two weeks has been sunny and warm

at the beach, and on any day there were DOZENS of dogs down there - - and their owners - - who were violating the CURRENT regulations on on-leash. Yet I have not seen a single GGNRA office writing citations to violators.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1353 **Comment Id:** 352389 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When I have told your officers as well as supervisors about these violations, they have been ignored. On one recent occasion, two of your officers were sitting in their vehicle in the parking lot of Ocean Beach, and I informed them that there were five dogs just over the sand dunes that were off leash in an on leash area. They basically ignored me, and when I asked them if they were going to do their job, one of your officers threatened me with being cited for some bogus violation.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1406 **Comment Id:** 352503 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you wish to regulate dog usage in those public areas you should target dog owner that do not clean up after their dogs or do not have recall control.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Morris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 578 **Comment Id:** 352667 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I disagree with changing the regulations to prohibit off-leash dogs from Muir Beach for the following reasons: 4) Nuisance dogs are occasionally a problem. These animals adversely effect the beach going experience for both those visitors with and without dogs. Rather enforce a leash-only rule, GGNRA should step up enforcement of policing the existing rules to remove nuisance dogs and cite their owners from.

Organization:

Commenter: TIMOTHY M SOWERBY **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1469 **Comment Id:** 352704 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Punishing all people for the acts of a few is an unfair and unjust approach that is completely counter to American values of justice and due process.

Organization:

Commenter: Beth Pruitt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 618 **Comment Id:** 352745 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I think that leash laws need to be enforced, and when there are numerous violations further restrictions need to kick in.
Organization:
Commenter: Marsha J Feinland **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 630 **Comment Id:** 352771 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft dog management plan. The proposed rules are an improvement but enforcement is the critical key.
Organization:
Commenter: Carolyn West **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 646 **Comment Id:** 352805 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The current dog management in place is restrictive enough. It's much more important to control problem dogs/owners than to punish people and dogs with overly restrictive policies.
Organization:
Commenter: Eric Hodges **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1468 **Comment Id:** 352853 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA is incapable of enforcing the leach laws, which leads to the violation of these laws, and stricter regulations. A ranger at the GGNRA meeting told me the dog ban was started because people were not obeying the leash guildlines - well if there were trained rangers there, people might. Also, the tasering of a dog walker in San Mateo by a GGNRA ranger shows the lack of training and inability to handle the issue.
Organization:
Commenter: Tom C Jagger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1468 **Comment Id:** 352854 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is foolish to ban dogs when you don't enforce the leach laws. I aways walk my dogs on a leash because of the rules, but many don't. This isn't good for the dogs because leached dogs don't like being approached by other free running dogs. Your lack of enforcement of the rules is only causing problems, not fixing anything.
Organization:

Commenter: Tom C Jagger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1497 **Comment Id:** 352919 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On this issue alone, without even considering the environmental degradation of 100's of dogs running in every direction leaving feces and especially repulsive dog feces bags everywhere, this rule is rarely abided by dog owners and I've never seen it enforced. This has lead me to experience deep fear, discomfort, and embarrassing moments when I should be in a hoped for peaceful, commune with nature. Instead dogs have chased me, attacked me, growled at me, bared their fangs at me - not just large canines but small nasty ones as well.
Organization:
Commenter: Marci V Scileppi **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1515 **Comment Id:** 352968 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I fully support setting expectations of visitors to all parks clearly. However I do not support the needless creation of laws or the make-work enforcement of those laws. The fewer the regulations, the greater the promotion of community and culture, and the better trained all park personnel are in how to educate *not* regulate their customers, the better.
Organization:
Commenter: Ian D Danforth **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1530 **Comment Id:** 353018 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Of the proposals, I feel strongly that the dogs should be required to be on-leash throughout the park system. From my experience, dog owners do not pay attention to the granularity of specific regions being off leash vs on leash. If they see dogs off leash in a certain area, they'll feel like the entire park is off leash. Another important item will be actually enforcing the on-leash requirement.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 751 **Comment Id:** 353123 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As a regular park user, I am quite aware that one of the huge issues concerning dogs in the park continues to be enforcement of the existing and proposed rules and regulations. (I also know that no one really wants to spend a lot of time and resources having to do/say/repeat the same thing over and over again. It is soooo tiresome.) But a strong and consistent enforcement policy would help to manage the various uses and users of the park system and help make the park feel like a park, and not a large, unsupervised dog run.
Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 776 **Comment Id:** 353268 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dog owners must be policed or they will allow their dogs to run, hunt, damage the areas that are sensitive to endangered species, children, families, and nature.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Bright Winn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 828 **Comment Id:** 353385 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I also think the park service could do a better job with signage, and tickets should be issued to pay for enforcement of the rules.
Organization:
Commenter: C Wichman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 878 **Comment Id:** 353546 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: To make regulations hold, there will need to be more rangers or other enforcement people dedicated to giving citations out to people breaking the regulations and the citations should carry a significant fine. I believe this would be a good use of resources since the damages that dogs cause can be significant.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1682 **Comment Id:** 353558 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Lastly, I want to comment about enforcement of leash requirements. It is true that many dog walkers will choose to let their dogs off leash to be under voice control, even in areas where leashes are required. It is also true that there are not enough NPS staff to patrol trails at all times.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1700 **Comment Id:** 353657 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Although I support the new policies, I wish to see stronger enforcement as well as visible fencing and/or natural barriers around off-leash areas. Protection of our natural resources and wildlife (especially threatened and endangered species) in our National Parks should be the PRIORITY. Enforcement is CRITICAL with dedicated Rangers for these areas to

educate dog-owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Tara McIntire **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1704 **Comment Id:** 353661 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm all for enforcement of owners who are jerks and don't pick up after their dogs, but restricting mine and my pet's shared enjoyment of park areas makes no sense. One of our greatest joys is to walk and explore uninhibited in Fort Funston. It brings pleasure to both of us to roam freely and interact with the other dog owners in the park.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1716 **Comment Id:** 353684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are part of that community, and these areas represent logical places for dog walking. But the number of off-leash dogs has become unsustainable, and commercial dog walkers are abusing their free access to these areas. The limit of six dogs/person is especially important, as is enforcement of leash laws in sensitive wildlife areas. I believe that voice control of off-leash dogs is rarely happening.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1741 **Comment Id:** 353724 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Often people have their dogs off leash when signs say it is forbidden. I find this disregard to the rules as hard to explain to my kids. In Seattle, where we moved from, police gave tickets to violators of leash laws in parks. As a result, such violations became the exceptions, not the norm.

Organization:

Commenter: Holly Warren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1768 **Comment Id:** 353752 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We are in favor of option E...we feel that there are hundred miles of trails in SF and Marin county thar are off limits to dogs and these few locations should have off leash rules for dogs. We do think owners should follow rules to be able to voice control their dog and also should be fined for not cleaning up after their dogs and/or having aggressive dogs out of theircontrol.

Organization:

Commenter: Virginia Cottone **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 926 **Comment Id:** 353778 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: When those without dogs and those with dogs share public space problems can and do arise. My experience has been that irresponsible dog owners are to blame for most of the problems. My comments focus on the things I think the plan should address to mitigate these shared use problems. Banning dogs from public space is NOT the answer. Addressing the irresponsible owners is the answer.
Organization:
Commenter: Rachel W Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 950 **Comment Id:** 353815 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Regulate dog walkers and fine people who let their dogs run out of control.
Organization:
Commenter: Cammy W Tyler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1787 **Comment Id:** 353855 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I know that the feces is a problem to the environment, but instead of being so incessant about having dogs on lease we should focus on issuing fines to those that are not picking up their dogs waste, which is the real problem at the parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Michele Batista **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1803 **Comment Id:** 354107 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Yes, irresponsible dog owners should be subjected to citations by park rangers and held accountable.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1826 **Comment Id:** 354268 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Whichever alternative is chosen, please be sure to enforce the laws. It seems as though there is no enforcement at Ocean Beach.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1831 **Comment Id:** 354288 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If there were enforcement and public outreach for the areas specifically designated as requiring dogs on leash, everyone would have a choice as to how they want to enjoy our public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara Ellis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1868 **Comment Id:** 354397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My primary concern is that the Snowy Plover Protection Area at Ocean Beach has become an off-leash dog play area during the restricted seasons, with no enforcement of park policies for the Protected Area. This has resulted in increased harassment of the Snowy Plover populations in the Protected Area.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1868 **Comment Id:** 354398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog owners rarely have their dogs on leashes in the Protected Area and I have witnessed increasing numbers of dogs harassing the Snowy Plovers and other birds. In some instances, I have also witnessed dog owners encourage their dogs to chase birds in the Protection Area as a play thing for enjoyment. Dog owners usually become confrontational when made aware of the Protected Area's on-leash and no-harrasment policies, and they usually do not seem to be aware of the Park's policies in the Protected Area or do not seem to be concerned, especially given the lack of enforcement.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1881 **Comment Id:** 354429 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My experience at Mori points is that about 40% o all dogs are off-leash even in dogs-on-leash areas. When evaluating dog impacts, given the lack of enforcement, it should be assumed that allowing on-leash use will lead to significant off-lease use also, especially in more remote areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Carlos Davidson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1901 **Comment Id:** 354503 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The big problem continues to be lax enforcement of existing regulations. I cannot tell you how many times I have been trying to photograph rare and/or sensitive birds or

animals and have had inconsiderate dog owners allow their dogs to terrorize the birds and animals right in front of me. And when I point out that the area is posted that dogs must be on leash they just laugh.

Organization:

Commenter: Joseph Morlan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1956 **Comment Id:** 354613 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I definitely see a problem with irresponsible dog-owners who don't have their dogs under control or don't clean up after them. For them their should be fines.

Organization:

Commenter: Marion R Wirsig **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1964 **Comment Id:** 354623 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe the current laws at Ocean Beach are sufficient, but it seems to me like it is never enforced and all the dog owners know this. If the preferred alternative allows for better enforcement, then please go forward with that plan.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2973 **Comment Id:** 355293 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I've observed that the vast majority of dog walkers also act responsible for their dogs, we shouldn't be punished for a minority of people who act carelessly with their dogs. Those individuals who act irresponsibly should be ticketed or otherwise reprimanded

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: kerry lan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3010 **Comment Id:** 355352 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because parks where we are able to exercise our dog are more and more limited. For those of us who KEEP THEIR DOG UNDER CONTROL we should not be continually restricted. Rather issue citations for those who are not properly controlling or training their dogs.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: James Eggers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3669 **Comment Id:** 355589 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dont pass a law you can not enforce and people will hate.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: catharine Clune **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2650 **Comment Id:** 356993 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If the beaches are closed to dogs it will be very hard to enforce. You will have to hire many law enforcement folks are chase down us dog lovers.
Organization:
Commenter: joanne f Rikli **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2619 **Comment Id:** 356912 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a dog owner myself, and one frequents the national recreation areas like ocean beach on a regular basis, I want offer the following recommendations: Please allow the dogs on the beach, but enforce strict penalties against people who fail to clean up after the pets or control their pets. Install doggie poop bags at the beach entrances, and put up warning signs for non compliance. While this may not solve the problem completely, it will serve to address the concerns posed by non-dog or even responsible dog owners, regarding this issue. The solution is not to ban an activity, but encourage responsible behavior. This should at least be attempted on a trial basis before an outright ban on dogs is initiated.
Organization:
Commenter: Maria Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2623 **Comment Id:** 356917 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Currently there is a large amount of non-compliance in the area due to this heavy handed approach, this will only get worse with any of the proposals. I know from past experience with the Boy Scouts in maintenance and creation of trails, that when you have overly heavy trail regulation people lose respect for the authority and do not follow any of the rules. However if you allowed space and trails for everyone, people will be much more compliant, people will be happier and the environment will be happier.
Organization:
Commenter: John Negley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2689 **Comment Id:** 357077 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If non compliance of the current rules is a major issue the revenue that could be generated from increased enforcement and ticketing far out weighs an all out ban.
Organization:

Commenter: Stephan N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2721 **Comment Id:** 357140 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs have a right to run free in San Francisco. Dog owners for the most part are respectful and abide by existing laws. Enforce existing laws rather than punishing all of us.
Organization:
Commenter: Scott Chernis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2747 **Comment Id:** 357183 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In the end I think we can make new rules and regulations but if there is no one there to enforce it and no real consequences nothing changes. There should be clear areas where off leash is okay and also areas where dogs must be on leash (no exceptions) so that this park can be used by the many different people that live here with or without dogs. The sensitive areas here should be protected from dogs as well.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2785 **Comment Id:** 357455 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Leash laws are openly disregarded and poorly enforced.
Organization:
Commenter: Lynn Strandberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2793 **Comment Id:** 357488 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need to be more carefully regulated in the GGNRA. Off-leash areas need to be fully enclosed. Clear and active enforcement is necessary for success.
Organization:
Commenter: Donald Forman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2836 **Comment Id:** 357599 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: key is clear rules and education. enforcement and respect on all all sides of the issue.
Organization:
Commenter: mildred a adler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2851 **Comment Id:** 357630 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There is virtually no enforcement of any regulations regarding dogs in the City or in National Park areas, and of course San Francisco has an unusual situation in that so much City land is also National Park land.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3107 **Comment Id:** 357913 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: You see these areas, you know how impossible this will be to enforce. Dont pass a law you can not enforce and people will hate.
Organization:
Commenter: Catharine Clune **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3280 **Comment Id:** 358041 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: PLEASE BE PREPARED THAT IF YOU OPEN UP MORE TRAILS for dog owners, be prepared to have more rangers there enforcing the leash law and having to put extra care into maintaining havoc the dogs are reaking in the National Forest areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Sandy g Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3302 **Comment Id:** 358113 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The overwhelming majority of dog owners in SF have proven themselves to be responsible - organizing park clean up days, participating in committees to find common ground with the NPS, and keeping their dogs under control. If there are individuals who do not control their dogs, those individuals should be ticketed.
Organization:
Commenter: Julie A Walsh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3329 **Comment Id:** 358155 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: -We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. -Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes. -Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.
Organization:
Commenter: Robert S Blumberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3342 **Comment Id:** 358191 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I respectfully ask that there be clearly marked areas for off-leash dogs with boundaries of some sort and areas that are for wildlife and people with no off-leash dogs. The areas that restrict dogs to leashes need to be patrolled so that the leash restriction is enforced. It is unfair to the birds, wildlife, and some people to have no areas that restrict dogs. This is exactly what occurs if there is lackadaisical enforcement. It is also unfair to push the enforcement responsibility off on the general public who may not be equipped to deal with aggressive people or dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Bonnie J Bompart **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3349 **Comment Id:** 358214 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I find it maddening and irresponsible that dog owners often ignore the off leash ordinances that do exist and that are clearly posted. There are 2 reasons for this One, many dog owners have a sense of entitlement. Two, there is no enforcement.

Organization:

Commenter: Diane Bahr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3355 **Comment Id:** 358225 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a dog lover, I still think that: dogs need to be more carefully regulated in the GGNRA; off-leash areas need to be fully enclosed; clear and effective enforcement is necessary for success.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3362 **Comment Id:** 358237 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our City has become over run with dogs and there does need to be controls on where they can be off leash and it needs to be enforced, please. I am afraid of big dogs and I therefore avoid Crissy field (which used to be my FAVORITE place to run and hang out with my kids - no more) and Fort Funston.

Organization: Private user

Commenter: Cathy Ritter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3365 **Comment Id:** 358252 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: First and foremost, the GGNRA should be for the people to enjoy the native flora and fauna found there. Not to be terrorized by dogs racing around off leash. Dogs and their

owners have gotten out of control. Please enforce some semblance of dog control. Parks are for people.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3371 **Comment Id:** 358261 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And finally, somehow the GGNRA should be better patrolled.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel J Richman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3398 **Comment Id:** 358325 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If native plants and wildlife are to have a chance in our parks, areas where off-lease dogs are permitted must be clearly marked and infractions must be noted, cited and fined

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Anne K Kelley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2355 **Comment Id:** 358376 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: NPS simply enforces the leash laws with the current level of access, the law-abiding dog owners can continue to enjoy the parks. But sensitive areas are protected. WIN-WIN!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2385 **Comment Id:** 358863 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The most restrictive plan is best because the presence of dogs anywhere in the GGNRA will necessitate major enforcement efforts to protect natural and cultural resources, as well as provide, visitor safety.

Organization:

Commenter: Patrick Skain **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2564 **Comment Id:** 359091 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Enforce leash laws and do not punish considerate dog walkers: I observe off leash dogs at Mori point frequently and as an 'on leash' dog walker, I find these loose dogs can sometimes be scary and sometimes go off trail which I agree could hurt surrounding wildlife. I have never seen a park ranger in this area enforce the leash laws. It does not seem fair to take

access away from these trails for considerate dog walkers that keep their dogs on the trail and on leash and who pickup after them. Why not instead post signs reminding people about leash laws and then enforce them?

Organization:

Commenter: A C **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2586 **Comment Id:** 359122 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The key to such regulations is enforcement. The current fine for having your dog off leash in a leash only area is sufficiently high to be a deterrent to rule breakers, however, as best I can see, the rule is rarely enforced. If the rule were enforced regularly, rule breaking would cease.

Organization:

Commenter: Corey Raffel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3414 **Comment Id:** 359148 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please enact and enforce stricter rules for controlling dogs. More areas need to be off-limits to dogs, especially off-leash dogs. A minority of irresponsible dog owners unfortunately will ruin the recreation area for everyone else and will destroy the wildlife. Please do not allow this to happen. Make and vigorously enforce restrictions on off-leash dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Jerome Harrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3422 **Comment Id:** 359174 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Of course, stronger wildlife protection measures will also require serious enforcement. Even the rules currently in effect are rarely enforced, and many dog owners behave as though any restriction on their animals is an unacceptable violation of their personal freedom. By all means designate areas in which dogs can run off leash; but please also designate and ENFORCE areas where dogs must be either leashed or even prohibited.

Organization:

Commenter: Charles B Hibbard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3707 **Comment Id:** 359389 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Though I don't have a dog, I love dogs and have dog friends in my neighborhood. I also am a lover of nature and the birds and animals and plants of the wild. To protect them and others like me, who enjoy peace and quiet, please set aside strictly enforced dog free areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Ann Kadyk **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3788 **Comment Id:** 359797 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And speaking of enforcement, the GGNRA cannot even enforce the status quo (alternative A) with their current staff. People frequently walk their dogs off leash on Ocean Beach on all parts of the beach and at all times of the year. There is no way that the GGRNA will have the resources to enforce alternative F at Ocean Beach, or anywhere else in the GGNRA, so people will just continue to do whatever they want.
Organization:
Commenter: Maeve F Clancy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3808 **Comment Id:** 359887 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Two points with respect to the proposed rules: - - - The proposed rules should be modified to require that off-leash areas be marked off with fencing, bushes or other natural borders. Otherwise, it is hard for dog owners to know what is permitted where, and violations are likely. - - - The dog management rules need to be better enforced. I have seen little enforcement in San Francisco to date. Without enforcement, the rules have much, much less meaning.
Organization:
Commenter: Linda L Carloni **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3852 **Comment Id:** 359980 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Education, training, and enforcement are all required. Enforcement of "Voice control" and on-leash areas is needed. Protection of picnicers, children, and other dogs from uncontrolled dogs needs an active proactive plan. Good rules are NOT enough. Especially in the highest multi-use areas, the presence of a Park ranger or sanctioned volunteer is needed to enforce rules and to foster the desired outcome.
Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth Ericson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4577 **Comment Id:** 360672 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please enforce the existing restrictions on dogs, not add more restrictions. Any additional lands added to the GGNRA should also allow dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: David Ogilvie **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4620 **Comment Id:** 361141 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I agree that some pet owners do not control their dogs and that they cause problems, but there are laws to cover that. Enforce them!
Organization:
Commenter: Tia K Pierce **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4651 **Comment Id:** 361180 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Laura M Gobbi **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4669 **Comment Id:** 361293 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Increase fines for out of control dogs. Catch people who do not clean up. Punish the irresponsible people... those who have dogs as well as those who do not. But do not punish responsible Marin residents who live here for the nature and outdoor opportunities we have here.
Organization:
Commenter: Noah Austin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4669 **Comment Id:** 361296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It questionable wether you will be bale to maintain such restrictions. Everyone will soon have a service animal that cannot be excluded from the trails. That companion is a safety animal.
Organization:
Commenter: Noah Austin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4670 **Comment Id:** 361304 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I hope that the NPS will seriously consider allowing offleash use to continue, in conjunction with more education and enforcement of existing rules. Otherwise, responsible dog owners will be the ones to suffer, as the irresponsible owners will continue to allow their dogs offleash in inappropriate ways.
Organization:
Commenter: Danielle Gensch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4687 **Comment Id:** 361327 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I regularly (between 4 and 6 times per week) walk my dog at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Baker beach and enjoy the recreation that it provides me, my family and my dog. I support the 'No action' alternative for these areas. Please enforce the existing rules of the 1979 Pet Policy.

Organization:

Commenter: David C Heughan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4716 **Comment Id:** 361382 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is not the mission of the GGNRA to assist or promote dog ownership. Therefore, park officials need to enforce the dog rules vigorously.

Organization:

Commenter: Saw Lim-Skain **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4771 **Comment Id:** 361489 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I suggest that you focus the plan entirely on using highly knowledgeable (about dogs) enforcement, and far stricter enforcement, of good, civil behavior within the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Weinberger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361561 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sweeney Ridge I prefer option 19A with the addition of all of the Baquiano trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica to its conclusion at the Portola Discovery site. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dog walking given the historical use of area (once an active military site, 4x4 vehicle trails, gas/water/electricity rights of ways, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation. "No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing. "Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. "Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361562 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston: I prefer option 16A over any other. I do not prefer options 16B,C, D, E, or F for the following reasons: "Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Funston trail systems. "Over stating of damage caused by dog usage given the historical use of area (once an active military site, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation. "No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing. "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural, open park setting. "Fort Funston is nationally-recognized as on of the greatest dog parks in the country. This kind of open space is not available anywhere else in the greater bay area. "Is enforcement realistic? It would seem by virtue of the vast, interconnecting trail system, the GGNRA would have to resort to excessive enforcement measures to regulate the trail use. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking. "Fort Funston has no real appeal to any other user group due to its cliffs, steep terrain, and climate. It is my opinion that restricting dog use will not invite the perceived low-impact user(hikers), rather it will invite an element of transients, loiters, and trespassers. The dog users are both the stewards and proprietors of this land; the presence of such unwanted elements is diverted by virtue of the presence of dog enthusiasts among others.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361563 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I Prefer 17A I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (4x4 vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a rural park setting. "Area is in a densely populated area with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking. "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking. "Symbolic fencing and signs have been effective in keeping people as well as people with dogs out of sensitive areas

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361564 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I prefer 20E I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle club/ motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.) "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a park setting. "Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4861 **Comment Id:** 361642 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I gave up on going to Muir beach years ago because of the preponderance of unleashed dogs, which I can accept, but we must restrict dogs in the rest of the park. There should be rules and they should be enforced, since, unfortunately, too many dog owners have a sense of entitlement - - - - they simply ignore signs.

Organization:

Commenter: david kimball **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4868 **Comment Id:** 361649 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Instead, cite irresponsible dog owners and use this money to improve public works and infrastructure. Hence, punish only the people causing the problem

Organization:

Commenter: Matt N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4998 **Comment Id:** 361904 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If there is no enforcement of dogs being off leash in specified leashed areas what point is all this? Every time I go for a walk/hike where dogs are supposed to be on a lease , there are dog owners who think that since there is no ranger giving them a ticket, it is OK to have their dogs off leash. Often I see folks with more than two dogs off lease, running in restricted areas, 40 Ft away from the owner. The owners cannot see what there dogs are doing and if they poo'ed the owners do not even know, or most times do not care. I've had dogs off lease run up to me and jump on me, and I am afraid of big dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahna Dominski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4140 **Comment Id:** 362073 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Currently my favorite walk is a off leash Oakwood fire road and trail. Now I will be banned from walking the trail and must walk up and back on the road leashed. Just like your bike use plan you can not go anywhere easily and make connections. Just in and out. Instead of this plan which man power must enforce thus wasting time giving nice thoughtful dog owners a ticket. Enforce current laws about poop and dogs running. Give hefty citations to those offenders who are really abusive. Educate others, be helpful and stop acting like the police and everyone is criminal. If your budget is short and can't fund the manpower to control bad dog owners and park visitors, re-prioritize. Stop the fancy infrastructure developments and increase workforce to effectively protect the park and good visitors from those doing their bad deeds.

Organization: Richardson Bay Maritime Association

Commenter: John H Shuey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4159 **Comment Id:** 362207 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would support a more strict enforcement of the current rules. I believe that there area very small number of dog owners who do not have proper voice control over their dogs when walking them off-leash. These owners should be fined. But, that small number of bad apples should not become justification to change the rules for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: Jesse Flowers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4181 **Comment Id:** 362215 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We would be in support of a more strict enforcement of the current rules. We believe that there area very small number of dog owners who do not have proper voice control over their dogs when walking them off-leash. These owners should be fined. But, that small number of bad apples should not become justification to change the rules for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5141 **Comment Id:** 362274 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A big part of seeing this plan be successful is the implementation process. I don't think it has been clearly spelled out how the plan will be implemented. Will each area have to do an implementation level plan of their own and environmental review? For example, will Fort Funston itself have an implementation level plan which will detail how the off leash and on leash areas will be contained? For example, if the Preferred Alt is chosen there is a ROLA on the beach which butts up against private property to the south, followed by state beach which is on-leash only ...will signs be posted to to tell people with dogs that they are leaving a ROLA and entering an area that is on-leash?

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5222 **Comment Id:** 362680 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I do not know how the Park Service intends to police the Beach, but I wish that there was more enforcement of already existing regulations. I'm tired of having to speak up for the Plover, only to be met with scorn.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5265 **Comment Id:** 362843 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do more public education! The signs about dogs required on leashes from Stairwell 21 to Sloat are almost nonexistent. Also, enforcement is a problem. I have called dispatch twice, but I am not comfortable with the situation: I have to go to the Great Highway, wait for the police to show up and then off he/she marches to the beach with all his/her guns and weapons, like now it's a criminal activity. Can't you have interns and others on the beach educating the dog owners on the rules and their responsibilities?
Organization:
Commenter: deidre martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5304 **Comment Id:** 362931 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I love animals, but when I have my own dog I act responsibly and obey leash laws. Many people here feel that they and their dogs are above the law, and I don't see anyone enforcing those laws. I would opt for dogs on leash on most trails, but the problem is that no one has seemed to enforce leash laws. I feel that the on-leash rule almost never works, since no one is there to enforce it.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363164 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are a high number of non-compliant dog owners who are repeat offenders.
Organization:
Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363168 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There is a high degree of variability between Park officers and at different park properties as to whether a non-compliant dog owner will be cited or given a warning.
Organization:
Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363171 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is apparent that the vast majority of violations of rules are never reported by visitors or observed by park staff. Naturally, many non-compliant owners change their illegal behaviors quickly upon noticing the presence of park staff. Due to the size of the parks compared to the parks small number of staff a visitor can hike for many hours, even days, without ever coming in contact with park staff. Therefore the incidents in this report should be considered as a small percentage of the overall violations that do occur within a year at the parks. The non-compliant dog owners listed in the majority (>90%) ncidents in the 2009 Criminal Incident record are given a verbal or written warning. The reports indicate that their names are entered into a database and they will be cited for subsequent infractions.
Organization:
Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5415 **Comment Id:** 363185 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Unfortunately, although there are many dog owners who respect the laws, there is a visible and vocal minority of dog owners who do not respect laws or the rights of other citizens. These people ruin the park experience for all users - dog owners and non-dog owners alike. They give other dog owners a bad name, and honestly if all dog owners were respectful and aware of the needs of wildlife and other people, perhaps there would be less need for stringent dog laws. Unfortunately, too many of our San Francisco citizens will not respect these laws unless they are effectively enforced.
Organization:
Commenter: JOHN P Dumbacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5446 **Comment Id:** 363286 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please go forth with the preferred alternative for Ocean Beach. I believe the current regulations would be sufficient if they were actually enforced, but that is not the case. Dog owners do not regulate each other, and the Park Service doesn't either.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363299 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please, please, please prohbit dogs on Ocean Beach. According to the current signs protecting the Snowy Plover from Lincoln Way to Sloat Blvd, they should be on leash almost all months of the year. 95% o the dogs are off leash. Is the law not enforced? Are the signs wrong? What do I tell my kids- - signs and laws don't matter?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4333 **Comment Id:** 363784 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My Husband and I live in the Richmond District and although we are not dog owners, we feel that curtailing the areas for dog walking is bad for the character and the freedom of the area. Angering the large population by shrinking their areas will lead to larger problems of enforcement. I suggest that you keep these historically dog friendly areas open and continue with your excellent management of our beloved GGNRA, which is an excellent balance for these lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Abby Draper **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4364 **Comment Id:** 363805 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Enjoying the recreation areas with my dog is an important part of my life and why I chose to live in this area. I feel that the parks belong to all of us, dog owners included. As with all societies, there must be rules. But most dog owners are compliant and respectful of the rules. Penalize the ones who are not but do not restrict those of us who are.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa K LeDuc **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5560 **Comment Id:** 363943 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I think these restrictions would dampen the experience of many many people (not to mention their animals). It will also encourage folks to break the rules, though I know this generates revenue.

Organization:

Commenter: john p whitty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5595 **Comment Id:** 363980 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Have you thought about how you're going to attempt to enforce this ridiculous idea? Think US marijuana laws. No one gives them a second thought which is exactly how the misguided leash rules will be viewed.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5648 **Comment Id:** 364070 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please consider the interests of all user groups, including wildlife, and police the beaches effectively to enforce any new regulations, which dog owners are already vowing to ignore.
Organization:
Commenter: Liza Wozniak **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5662 **Comment Id:** 364091 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I propose to regularly ticket for off-leash dog-walking where it is not allowed in the GGNRA. Then people will get used o leash ing their dog when they're supposed to.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A P N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5664 **Comment Id:** 364097 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The unwillingness or inability of law enforcement agencies to control illegal off leash activity has left the general public with no recourse. My recommendation would be for the Park Service to take positive steps to leverage their limited enforcement activities so as to be effective in combating this scourge on our public parks.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5668 **Comment Id:** 364102 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I support the preferred alternative F. It adds a lot of good protections and balances wildlife protection with the many uses of the park lands. There are good protections of wildlife in Alternative F. I encourage GGNRA to back up the implementation of the new plan with genuine enforcement. That would mean issuing citations to violators.
Organization:
Commenter: David Wimpfheimer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5678 **Comment Id:** 364117 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I strongly support the Draft Dog Management Plan. It is crucial to have some trails available with no dogs on those trails. At present it is very difficult to find a trail where

there are not dogwalkers. Trails should be very well marked and fenced if needed. Visitors should be limited to only two dogs in the park. It is crucial that new dog regulations be enforced.

Organization:

Commenter: David E Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4374 **Comment Id:** 364130 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It is sad and unsettling to encounter the too common bad dog owner whose off leash animals fight other dogs, bother/scare people and randomly attack and harass wildlife. I frequently see dogs not even in visual range of their owners, let alone under voice command. Sadly, this knucklehead minority of bad dog owners necessitate more rigorous protections be put into place, and most importantly that implementation and enforcement of rules be a priority for law enforcement. Periods where citation can be expected by bad dog owners, with serious enhancements for repeat offenders, will get the word out and alter behaviors with a minimal investment by NPS.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5720 **Comment Id:** 364184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not allowing dogs on most of Pacifica's trails will keep us from these spots or cause us to become lawbreakers when in reality we are stewards of the trails we frequent, always monitoring litter, watching for grafitti, and caring for the native plants. Please, please, please keep our parks friendly for 2 and 4 legged beings who need each other and need fresh air and exercise.

Organization: Pacifica Beach Coalition

Commenter: Lynn M Adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5752 **Comment Id:** 364238 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Moreover, if you limit the areas where dogs can be off leash, you will have to increase the time and attention of your excellent personnel devoting themselves to enforcement. I would rather they use thier time and resources for more interesting activities such as park promotion and nature conservancy. Perhaps, more aggressive enforcement in areas that are designated on-leash needs to be done, thereby setting some clear boundaries.

Organization:

Commenter: Diego E Castaneda **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5775 **Comment Id:** 364283 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I own a Greyhound that must be kept on-leash at all times unless in an enclosed

GGNRA160590

area, due to his propensity for wandering. It's frustrating to responsible walk him on on-leash trails and come into contact with off-leash dogs and their irresponsible owners. More enforcement of these on-leash areas really is necessary to teach people that the rules DO apply and they must follow them. Without proper enforcement, people will constantly let their dogs off-leash and nothing will really change from the past.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura Wilkinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5824 **Comment Id:** 364364 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have seen no study that documents the positive effects of these restrictions. I can see major noncompliance and civil disobedience if the principal users of this urban park are restricted for no clear purpose.

Organization:

Commenter: James W Moyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5848 **Comment Id:** 364400 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It will take a long time for dog owners to get used to any changes as they feel entitled so some kind of enforcement will unfortunately be required.

Organization:

Commenter: Ben holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5855 **Comment Id:** 364418 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What I do support in terms of regulation is enforcing the basic rules that are already in place. It seems to me that a lot of restrictions are born out of visitor complaints about people who are not following the rules which are already set. The parks create restrictions as a result and then create furhter restrictions when the rules continue to be broken - skipping the step where the current restrictions are inforced. Typically, people don't like dogs around because of the waste or becuase dogs are not behaving. Waste removal and basic behavior skills are already an expectation but I can't say I've ever seen them inforced.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah F Hodges **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5938 **Comment Id:** 364677 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are already areas where off leash dogs are banned but dog owners ignore the rules and there seems to be no enforcement of them. I would urge that enforcement of off leash dog regulations be enforced.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert M Cullison **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5984 **Comment Id:** 364860 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, you will likely find that people will ignore the new rules. It will be very expensive to hire the number of rangers required to patrol all of these areas.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6045 **Comment Id:** 365237 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Here, is my problem with passing the no dog zone, having the leash law etc., the laws are only as good as their enforcement. This means that the public shouldn't have to tell others they are breaking the law or public shouldn't have to call the GGNRA to have a patrol officer come out to ticket them. What it means is if you're going to add the NO DOG ZONE ALONG WITH THE LEASH LAW then you NEED to hire more officers or have the officers make their presence known on the beach and other areas the law will impact so they can warn, ticket or arrest.
Organization:
Commenter: Renee N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6055 **Comment Id:** 365264 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have also witnessed many dog-owners behave with careless disregard for whatever dog use rules might apply in a given situation. I have concluded that enclosed off-Â-leash dog areas are the best way to keep pets, people, and plovers (as well as other wildlife) safe from harm. The other solutions tried, which allow, for example, for owner discretion, or for off-leash dogs in designated open spaces, or for timed use, simply do not work to protect people, pets, wildlife and the environment. It seems that very specific, enclosed areas will clarify the situation. Enforcement becomes pretty obvious. If outside an enclosed area, the off-leash dog must be considered in violation, a ticket issued.
Organization:
Commenter: Eugenie Marek **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6076 **Comment Id:** 365329 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: All of the current issues are occurring despite the threat of expensive federal tickets for leash violations. GGNRA has not demonstrated any capacity for sensible enforcement of existing laws; rangers either rigidly enforce leash laws or (for the most part) are completely absent from the scene. Why would anyone expect ROLA enforcement to be any better? At least under the current regulations all park users can understand that those who choose to take their

chances and violate leash laws risk facing legal sanctions as well as liability for any injuries or property damage caused by the actions of their uncontrolled pets.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6322 **Comment Id:** 365523 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: General Policy-Licensing Laws. The strongest GGNRA licensing laws should be firmly established by the GGNRA to protect wildlife and other natural resources. The general policy should NOT rely on any city, county, or out-of-town/state/country "practices" nor should it be dependent upon other jurisdiction regulations. While we agree that the laws should be posted throughout the park, we strongly recommend that the penalties for noncompliance should also be posted, and that enforcement should be incorporated in to the dog management plan.

Organization: Public Interest Coalitoin

Commenter: Marilyn Jasper **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365754 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A) I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365755 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E) I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the new Devils Slide Trail. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military

site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6707 **Comment Id:** 365775 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please come ticket the offenders

Organization:

Commenter: Arron Apperson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6351 **Comment Id:** 365786 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We feel that stronger enforcement of already in place regulations is all that's needed. Leash law, voice control and, most importantly, "picking up after your pet" (including horses in my opinion).

Organization:

Commenter: mark ingwersen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366020 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGAS supports the creation of off-leash areas in San Francisco-indeed, the city already has more off-leash play areas than any other in the US. Moreover, its is widely accepted that San Francisco's city parks are de facto off-leash parks; leash laws are rarely followed and almost never enforced, again with significant impacts to local wildlife and non-dog owners in city parks. We also do not oppose the creation of off-leash areas within the GGNRA, provided they are (1) in appropriate areas, (2) fully enclosed by natural or symbolic barriers, and (3) patrolled to ensure compliance.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6242 **Comment Id:** 366177 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Francisco dog owner behavior is that if dogs are allowed, the owners will let them off leash. There is no reason to expect this behavior to change. There are not enough park rangers in the universe to enforce compliance with leash regulations in GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366236 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS also fails to investigate the effect of improved enforcement of current rules, increased citations of violators, and improved signage and fencing on minimizing negative impacts on habitats and wildlife while still maintaining the more permissive current dog policy.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6293 **Comment Id:** 366456 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The solution is to better enforce the current 1979 Pet Policy and not to deny access to responsible dog owners who follow the regulations. Almost all the current dog problems are caused by dog owners not abiding by the current guidelines. The answer to this problem is not to close off areas to dogs but to provide enforcement to those that do not comply.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6299 **Comment Id:** 366476 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Also please enforce the current leash laws With tickets. People brake them all the time and the officers Explained to me tickets are rarely given.

Organization: Mom in PAC heights

Commenter: Tami N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6613 **Comment Id:** 367193 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Removing these wonderful off leash beach places will make more dog owners break the law so that their dogs can have some healthy excercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Roberta Rovner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6618 **Comment Id:** 367231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Before you try a different path, I feel that the GGNRA needs to consistently enforce the rules that are in place. Part of the reason for the issues that you cite in your study result from the lack of policing of the rules currently in place to preserve the resource

Organization:

Commenter: Charles Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6439 **Comment Id:** 367502 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I ask the National Park Service to keep your current regulations but spend more time and resources actively enforcing your regulations to ensure an optimal experience for all

Organization:

Commenter: Don Sparks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6480 **Comment Id:** 367551 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Enforcement is another key piece of the puzzle. In my experience, folks will do what they want (for example, let their dogs chase birds, run off-leash in leash-required areas, etc), unless there's a clear incentive to follow the rules. Citizens attempting to enforce the rules themselves is not a good plan. I've had way too many scary experiences with dog walkers when I try to point out signage, for example, that says dogs need to be on leash.

Organization: Sierra Club

Commenter: Karen Babbitt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6632 **Comment Id:** 367552 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And finally, your limited staff must have more constructive things to do than cite dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Louise Frankel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368117 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Do not make the same mistake as the SF Rec. & Park Dept. has made by fearing the misperception of dog owner political power and not enforce dog use. As it is now, RPD staff (gardeners, managers, recreation directors) is instructed to not confront dog owners when they violate Park Codes, yet welcome private residents to "self-police" and take the brunt of dog owner rage at being told they must stop bad behavior in local parks and playgrounds. The number of Park Ranger officers is very low and enforcing dog rules has deliberately been virtually ignored. Commercial dog walkers should prove easily visible training, licensing, and with proper personally supplied cleaning materials versus taxes paid for and supplied.

Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6645 **Comment Id:** 368194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Enforcement: We strongly feel that the protection of sensitive habitat is important. We encourage enforcement of park rules to limit the disturbance of wildlife, vegetation, and possible special-status species habitat. We encourage the GGNRA to work with the community with regard to prior outreach and education.
Organization: Pacifica City Council
Commenter: Mary Nihart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6648 **Comment Id:** 368220 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This includes enforcing laws banning dogs from certain areas of the park. In my 7 years as an HRT volunteer in the Marin Headlands, I have seen, first hand, how the increasing number of illegal dogs, even on a leash can harm natural habitat, jumping at quail, relieving themselves on native plants, and barking at visitors.
Organization:
Commenter: Jim Morrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368450 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In discussing management alternatives at various other sites, NPS admits that the level of leash law compliance at many other sites is low. Yet the impact of noncompliance on visitor experience and safety and on resources at those sites is not explored. It should not be necessary to re-evaluate compliance rates to establish enforcement targets, as proposed in the SEIS, which re-evaluation process would allow serious impacts to occur for several more years. It is obvious that as appropriate in the case of contempt for regulations that direct enforcement of rules is necessary (McCool & Christensen, 1996).
Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 4404 **Comment Id:** 368476 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: At Muir beach ticket people who allow their dogs to hurt the new project, which is the point. No one believes dogs are harming the sand. If there are going to be police out there issuing citations, why not have them issue citations for the harmful activity? Making the whole beach leash only punishes the innocent majority. Moreover the people who let their dogs roam on the newly planted area are unlikely to respect the leash law anyway. Ticket people for the harmful activity and it will be discouraged as much as ticketing everyone with a dog off

leash,

Organization:

Commenter: patrick ridge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6567 **Comment Id:** 368706 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The fact that Marin County Board of Supervisors has labeled this a "defacto dog ban" policy and that Congresswoman Speier considers the plan "unacceptable" makes it clear that no amount of discussion will change the minds of those who want to be able to walk their dogs where they want. So I hope whatever plan is eventually approved will include the enforcement procedures that will ensure compliance.

Organization:

Commenter: Bill Wilson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369341 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Taking into account the data regarding the numbers of dogs chasing either shorebirds or plovers in context of the frequency of the behavior over time, it seems ticketing of the miniscule number of offenders would be appropriate rather than punishing all for the transgressions of a very few. It is a bit like forcing all cyclists in the GGNRA to ride with training wheels because a very few speed through the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6670 **Comment Id:** 369544 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The critical element for any successful regulation of off leash dog activity is active enforcement of the rules. Unfortunately, the National Park Service has shown an inability to enforce any rules about off leash dog use. The only effective program is a complete ban on off leash dog walking and in some areas an outright ban on any dogs even on leash because it is clear and enforceable.

Organization: Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

Commenter: Norman La Force **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6670 **Comment Id:** 369547 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Preferred Alternative is inadequate because it clearly assumes that a program of vigorous enforcement of the rules when the record has shown that no such enforcement has occurred in the past and there is no evidence that the financial and staffing resources will be provided to ensure adequate enforcement, This impact analysis impacts from little to no enforcement is lacking in the SEIS, and thus the assumption of adequate enforcement

cannot be made for purposes of basing a choice of alternative. It is utterly arbitrary and capricious.

Organization: Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

Commenter: Norman La Force **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/30/2014)

PO2010 Park Operations: Affected Environment (Substantive)

1. **Many commenters noted that the ranger/enforcement presence in the park was very low. A few commenters felt that rangers were sometimes threatening or rude, and felt that the attitude of some rangers was not good, while others felt that rangers were constantly working to try to enforce compliance, and that dog owners sometimes threatened rangers.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 45 **Comment Id:** 344093 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have never seen any rangers or enforcement ever present in all the years I've lived here and enjoyed the beach. Rangers ignore the stretch near Daly City south if funston. I love dogs but the place is overrun now, and it shows.

Organization:

Commenter: J Zolli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1059 **Comment Id:** 351499 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: While some service members have been courteous often personnel have bee rude and surly if not physically threatening when I was exercising my dog. Quite frankly as a well manned older woman I posed no threat and their bullying behavior and attitude toward a city resident was not necessary.

Organization: Dog owner. (Murphy)

Commenter: P Stock **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1400 **Comment Id:** 352445 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And in my 13 years of frequenting Mori Point, I have yet to see one enforcement officer, hence the low number of reported incidents in the most recent report. If there are not enough resources to enforce on-leash and excrement pick-up policies, the proposed alternative of on-leash is useless. We are back to the status quo of lack of safety, damaged ecology for the animals that do belong in the area, as well as the unhygienic waste ubiquitous to Mori Point.

Organization:

Commenter: Summer Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3280 **Comment Id:** 358040 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am sure that the National Park Service is tired of having to discipline dog owners, I see them writing tickets here all the time to owners who have their dogs off leash the next day again in leashed area, educated individuals that cannot understand why their dog must be on leash and I am certain the Park Service is concerned about the welfare of fragile hillsides and indigenous flora and fauna that is being destroyed by off leash dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Sandy g Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363176 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Non-compliant, aggressive and/or abusive dog owners interfere and endanger Federal Officers and Rangers

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5971 **Comment Id:** 364840 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Equally important is educated, aware, responsible, reasonable and cooperative enforcement personnel. The NPS has some distance to travel before attaining this status. NPS' goal must not be perceived as the eradication of dogs and their owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Garril Page **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters noted that many areas of the GGNRA were not well maintained by park staff, including restrooms, trash collection, sand on paths and walkways, and signage. Some commenters felt that noted behaviors, such as driving along fire roads, appeared to be detrimental to the environment and special status species.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1275 **Comment Id:** 352215 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA is an absentee custodian of the GGNRA parks in San Francisco. There are insufficient restrooms, garbage cans and the roads and paths are poorly maintained. While it was two members of Ocean Beach Dog Walkers just the other day witnessed a man defecating on the Stairs of Ocean Beach just south of the Cliff House. There are no Public Restrooms in the area and refuse cans are in short supply.

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1785 **Comment Id:** 353851 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In all my years of hiking on these trails I can't recall ever seeing any Park

Service people out on foot on the trails either south of Muir Beach or North on the Owl Trail or the old Banducci Farm Rd. I've only seen them in NPS vehicles driving on the fire roads and creating large ruts when muddy. Certainly that is far more destructive of the environment than a few isolated people with dogs on leash. If you folks hardly ever walk these trails I don't see how you can justify prohibitng people like me from hiking with my dogs on leash. You can't possibly know what the conditions are or even if they affect the environment at all.

Organization: Muir Beach Community Services District

Commenter: Alex Johnston **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361916 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If GGNRA is truly concerned about environmental impact,why have I never seen them stop to pick up trash? Why do I see them driving on the beach just to hand out tickets/warnings to dog owners? Why are they allowed to drive motorcycles on the beach disturbing the wildlife just to give tickets to dog owners? Don't these practices alone cause a detrimental impact?

Organization:

Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362667 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Try putting actual dog waste bags in the empty dispenser in the lot. And try making better signage letting people know all the rules. Inform and educate people, and then enforce the rules. The NPS has not provided a single ranger or staffer on the beach to make sure the restored wetland is properly cared for since the beach re-opened.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5627 **Comment Id:** 364030 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston has essentially been abandoned for the past few YEARS by the GGNRA, leaving large portions of the trails in this beautiful area inaccessible for the elderly, the handicapped, families with strollers, and others. While the concrete trails used to be cleared after high winds have caused sand to build up, this has not occurred in the past few years. In fact, a very large sand berm has formed at the northern end that makes it the end point for many walkers who are able to and choose to go that far. Where have the workers been?? Some of the garbage bins along the trails have been removed so that the GGNRA doesn't have to do the work required to empty them. The water fountain just off the parking area is a disgusting, malfunctioning mud puddle that needs attention. Necessary minor fixes to allow drainage have been ignored by GGNRA my our understanding that the GGNRA personnel involved in this project includes a number of inherently anti-dog people, which in and of itself demonstrates undue bias.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6685 **Comment Id:** 369031 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a practical matter, the GGNRA has failed to monitor the resources; consequently, there have been no mitigations to address problems as they arise. In truth, were the GGNRA's claims of degradation of resources even valid (we contend they are not), a case could be made that any degradation of the GGNRA property is due to GGNRA management's failure to adhere to accepted practice regarding land use planning and management.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369488 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: These conditions are present for months on end. The sand overflows from the beach on to and across the promenade path. Imagine a disabled person trying to make their way through mounds of sand on the walkway. And the planters on the left were stripped of their ice plant and native plants were planted, surrounded by red pea gravel. The plants died, the pea gravel became dislodged and flows on to the walkway to provide yet another hazard for the walker. The one photo where there appears to be a ridge running through the sand is actually the seawall. On the beach side the sand is up to the top of the seawall, and on the promenade side the sand has piled up so high the walkway has been obliterated. Yet in this SEIS the GGNRA complains about spending 1.5 hours a day picking up trash at Ocean Beach which is over 3 miles long. From these photos it does not appear 1.5 hours a day is enough, and it also appears that people are bringing their trash up off the beach and often placing it next to overflowing trash receptacles. You cannot put the responsibility for this mess on dogs. The GGNRAs poor performance in maintenance of Ocean Beach should preclude them from holding the property- - it certainly does not meet the requirements as stated above in the documents of transfer.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. Commenters stated that the presence of dogs and dog walkers was a benefit to the GGNRA, as dog walkers often provided waste receptacles and cleaned up waste, benefiting park operations.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5676 **Comment Id:** 364111 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: People have been responsibly walking their dogs both on and off leash in this area for decades. Dog walking, and being out enjoying the Rancho, has brought our community together and has actually been beneficial to the area by providing waste cans and bags, and facilitated communication and resolving of issues that arise in the open space (fallen trees, lost dogs or people, illegal dirt biking, etc)

Organization: Montara
Commenter: Nancy E Wilder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368228 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The communities of Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada have a long history of responsible off-leash dog walking in Rancho. The Montara Dog Group (MDG), which has over 400 members and represents over 600 dogs from Half Moon Bay to Pacifica, have been good stewards to the area, providing waste bins, promoting responsible dog guardianship and caring for an area the GGNRA, presently, does not have the infrastructure or resources to maintain.
Organization:
Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 109 **Comment Id:** 343889 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dog-fearing park officials are not suitable for their job and should be removed.
Organization: Pythom Inc
Commenter: Tina O Sjogren **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 215 **Comment Id:** 350127 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dog owners in general are good at picking up their own and their dog's mess. If this is such a problem, why does the GGNRA not hire 1 or even 2 park rangers? All of the times I have been to the park, I have not seen one. They should enforce the rules to both dog owners and non-dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: John Nguyen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1159 **Comment Id:** 351796 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On the beach currently, between Lawton and Kirkham, there is a broken pier pylon (festooned with 40-50 rubber tires), a large grey plastic box (maybe it's a broken pier bumper-now it just collects trash) and a rotting seal carcass. Each of these things has been lying on the beach for MONTHS! If the sea birds were as delicate as some of the EIS suggests, surely this is not good for them.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1295 **Comment Id:** 352253 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: park is very low maintenance the way it is
Organization:
Commenter: Rico M Tecson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1313 **Comment Id:** 352292 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am very familiar with the Coastal Fire Road and the Coyote Ridge Trail. Over these last few years, I have noticed a significant increase in dogs off leash on these trails. There are no dogs allowed on these trails and signs are posted. Most of the owners are fully aware of the restrictions as many of them live in the surrounding neighborhoods that are adjacent to the GGNRA. The rules are completely ignored. Many dog owners view the GGNRA as an extension of their backyard and do as they please. Park service employees are no where to be found to enforce the rules.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 898 **Comment Id:** 353611 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The NPS has failed to provide adequate signage to inform dog owners of their responsibilities and the fines are too low to make an effective impression.
Organization:
Commenter: Philip M Klasky **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1868 **Comment Id:** 354400 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have also witnessed Park Law Enforcement personnel drive their vehicles in the Snowy Plover Protection Area and in most occasions at night, particularly in the zones where the Snowy Plovers nest/rest. This seems to be in complete violation of the Parks policies in the Protected Area and have direct negative impacts to the Snowy Plover nesting populations. Would like to recommend the Parks Service take action to restrict vehicle use in the Protected Area, particularly during the restricted seasons.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361990 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I watch each day as people traipse through the newly restored and fenced

delicate dune and riparian areas. Children play in the lagoon and creek. Bonfires burn after hours. People camp in the dunes. Litter is strewn across the beach and left at the bridge entrance on the beach. I carry home an armful of trash each morning when I walk the dog. Where is the park maintenance staff to clean up the litter every day? The dispenser by the footbridge should have signage notifying owners and be filled with plastic bags, and in addition a disposal bin could be placed for pet waste.

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5176 **Comment Id:** 362442 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm a frequently user of Crissy Fields and Fort Funston. Current maintence is poor. The Crissy Fields protected area for the Snowy Plovers is sand with dried and or dead plants. Why is there a need to restrict off leash while current maintence falters? Your report stated the snowy plovers have decreased due to mercury. That is an ocean problem, not dog. The walkways at Fort Funston have cracks, crumbling, and collective sand dunes .

Organization:

Commenter: Shirley Wing **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363170 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Overall there is a tremendous burden to the U.S. Park staff in dealing with non-compliant pet owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5971 **Comment Id:** 364842 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For example, in clearly-identified, controlled access areas with dog feces pollution, such as Marin's Upton Beach, why haven't fines paid for staffing and enforcement to correct the problem?

Organization:

Commenter: Garril Page **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5457 **Comment Id:** 368648 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On Mori Ridge Trail, I have witnessed trimming of overgrown vegetation (including coastal scrub) up to 4 feet on either side of the trail. This annual maintenance surely causes more impacts to sensitive habitat along this trail system than trail users (including dogs).

Organization:

Commenter: Brett Becker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369170 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, for over a year, GGNRA management refused to change the signage in the Park to reflect the Court's ruling in derogation of 36 C.F.R. Section i.7(a)(1)(4). For photo documentation of the illegal signage (see http://oceanbeachdog.home.mindspring.com/id8.html). This illegal and confusing signage clearly created user conflict and was detrimental to the safety and enjoyment of those visiting the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369329 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, dead wildlife such as seals, sea lions and birds are not being promptly removed from the beach. The rotting carcasses of these dead creatures are left indefinitely on the beach to attract ravens and other plover predators. Recently, a carcass of a cow washed up on Ocean Beach where it sat for almost a week before officials removed it. The dead body was literally covered with ravens, ripping and eating the dead animal's flesh.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369332 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Internal GGNRA records show the GGNRA bargained with USFWS in 1996, sacrificing our off-leash recreational opportunities in order to get USFWS to agree to allow bulldozing in this same area of Ocean Beach. The ESA is very clear that it is not permissible to modify the habitat of an endangered or threatened species when they are not present, but expected to return. One example would be the prohibition of the removal of trees that hold an eagle's nest, even when the eagle is not present or utilizing the nest. We understand the GGNRA is modifying the beach in this area to minimize the effects of erosion and the drifting of sand on to the Promenade and Great Highway. The GGNRA has refused to acknowledge in any significant fashion that erosion and the progressive collapse of the shoreline limits the areas where the plover can roost and forage, as well as the quality of foodsource for the plover at Ocean Beach. The narrowing beach puts the plover in closer and closer proximity to all users of the beach, thereby increasing the disturbance to the plovers. These conditions will progress despite the GGNRA's move to ban dogs entirely.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6662 **Comment Id:** 369526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a girl scout and do beach cleanup at Ocean Beach - this year it was pouring rain. I picked up lots of people garbage but didn't see dog garbage. Why aren't there garbage cans on the beach?

Organization:

Commenter: Claire A Kosewic **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/02/2014)

PO4000 Park Operations: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives (Substantive)

1. **Commenters felt that the dog management plan and the preferred alternative would present a high cost of enforcement and that this was not warranted. Commenters felt policing dog restrictions was not the best use of limited funds for enforcement, and that other issues were more pressing. Commenters were concerned about the ability of NPS to fund adequate enforcement of new regulations, and that more rangers would be needed.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 219 **Comment Id:** 350133 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Simply stating a trail is leash only does not make it so. It must be enforced. The NPS does not have the enforcement capacity now to enforce that rule. And the future strongly suggests that NPS capacity will be cut rather than enhanced. As a consequence, stating a leash only rule has the effect of allowing unleashed dogs on trails in many instances.

Organization:

Commenter: Roger D Harris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 519 **Comment Id:** 351855 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I'm also concerned about the time, resources, and money that it will take from GGNRA to implement these new proposals. I think the time, resources, money can be better utilized on other important issues.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1208 **Comment Id:** 351983 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Lastly, I would like to address the economic sense of further restricting parks from dog friendly space. Any tightening of dog restrictions would naturally require additional resources for policing and enforcing said policies. With our park systems already under intense financial pressures (park closers, etc), could our park dollars not be better spent reopening and maintaining our parks system instead of degrading the experience of some the parks systems biggest advocates and supporters?

Organization: Citizens for Progress and Sanity

Commenter: Charles Gulick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1919 **Comment Id:** 354554 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The notion that increasing regulations won't lead to increased enforcement costs is obviously flawed. Restrictions are meaningless if not enforced and that takes ranger hours and money. I imagine it would take a lot of money to keep a resident of muir beach from taking their dog onto the beach or the coastal trail.

Organization:

Commenter: David V Gainer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6062 **Comment Id:** 365289 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Park Service needs to have an unbiased review of the costs vs. benefit consideration of the proposals. 34 years ago the Citizens Advisory Comittee made a reasoned evaluation and determination of the best areas to locate off leash acess with the least impairment of resources. Making a change off the prior sound analysis will be exceedingly costly and have little environmental or social policy benefit, if any. I, like many, believe it will actually have adverse impact on the people, and also will be adverse to the Park Service. Such expensive and likely contentions changes should not be made absent a clear showing of benefit.

Organization:

Commenter: John Keating **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters stated that the plan would result in increasing issues in the park, including homelessness, crime, and increased trash on the beaches, which would present a larger issue for park operations. Other commenters stated that the plan would reduce the number of people who use the parks, which would decrease support for the parks as well as impact visitors.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1520 **Comment Id:** 352982 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The users of the parks are its potential allies - the people who vote to support, who fund-raise, who come to the defense of the National Park system when it's threatened. Making policies that turn them off is bad not just for those with dogs, but for all of us who care about the environment and want others to care about it too. Many people feel their comments earlier were not considered in preparing this SEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Rupa Bose **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4250 **Comment Id:** 353608 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: It will also discourage use of Fort Funston, which will only increase existing problems with vandalism and drug use by reducing the numbers of law-abiding and considerate citizens there. This ill-advised new policy will almost certainly increase the costs of maintaining Fort Funston at a time of severe budget challenges for the Park Service.

Organization:
Commenter: Kevin Shannon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4828 **Comment Id:** 353850 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: Without the people walking their dogs, many of the beaches would not be as clean. I regularly pick up all sorts of trash when picking up after my dog as do most of my friends.
Organization:
Commenter: Claire A Halenbeck **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2075 **Comment Id:** 355661 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Further, if you continue to restrict access to the most active people within this county, you will find that these parks slowly fall from the public eye and when the next 'budget crisis' comes up, no one will be there to champion the cause to keep them open.
Organization:
Commenter: Erin Sunkel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4824 **Comment Id:** 361602 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If Funston dog activity is limited, that place will likely see a crime spike as it is isolated and has many hidden nooks and crannies. In addition, dog walkers voluntarily have monthly cleanups of the park. People really care about and love the fort, and this cleanup is pure volunteer work that costs taxpayers nothing.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361917 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If these areas are closed the impact on the rest of the city will take a toll. Dogs walkers walk their dogs at all times, in the morning, late at night. They have been one to report crimes, deaths, and other potential hazards on the beach. Dog walkers move out, homeless, vagrants,increased crime and gangs move in. Dog walkers act as a no cost preventive measure against these.
Organization:
Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6136 **Comment Id:** 365591 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The parks in our city are important to we who pay the bills (taxes), it is how we have our downtime, and if you tell me certain members of my family are no longer welcome, ie my dog, we will stop going and our parks will go unappreciated and could fall into the hands of droves of vagrant's encampments, trash,human feces, illegal activity, and even more used needles.

Organization:

Commenter: Ginny Lamini **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **One commenter noted that reducing the areas where dogs are allowed would decrease the burden on enforcement staff, while another felt that this burden would not be decreased as officers would still need to patrol other areas. Some commenters noted that park staff would have to deal with the anger of individuals no longer allowed to walk their dogs in areas of the GGNRA.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1035 **Comment Id:** 351461 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This is a public park paid for using tax funds. Like many other public service, the rising costs of labor, lawsuits, and the increased bureaucracy create a budget deficit. However, the cost of the above will not be affected by eliminating off leash access. Rangers will still have to patrol/service the park, lawsuits will still occur, and the bureaucracy will still exist.

Organization:

Commenter: Arthur Storey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1450 **Comment Id:** 352580 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: These regulations will create countless negative interactions between dogs and their owners and the legal enforcement of it will be an unwarranted expenditure of time and effort that should be spent elsewhere where real safety concerns exist.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian W Veit **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363174 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The burden on the patrolling officers could be greatly reduced by reducing the area that domestic animals are allowed. While on-leash will always be the preferance for naturalists the burden of cat and mouse game of on-leash/off leash game that is repeatedly played by irresponsible pet owners in the mnay areas of sensitive habitat could be virtually eliminated by making these changes.

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5752 **Comment Id:** 364238 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Moreover, if you limit the areas where dogs can be off leash, you will have to increase the time and attention of your excellent personnel devoting themselves to enforcement. I would rather they use thier time and resources for more interesting activities such as park promotion and nature conservancy. Perhaps, more aggressive enforcement in areas that are designated on-leash needs to be done, thereby setting some clear boundaries.

Organization:

Commenter: Diego E Castaneda **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6082 **Comment Id:** 365378 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This plan isn't reasonable. Our dogs need space to run. This plan will only cause angry conflicts in parks where people should be doing healthy things. The people working in these areas will take the brunt of the publics' anger if this enforced. Everybody loses under this plan.

Organization: Dog owner

Commenter: Larry J Yant **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6387 **Comment Id:** 365820 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: A change in the policies governing these areas will cause confusion and anger, and will require a huge increase in staff to enforce, explain, and deal with all of the unhappiness that will be caused. I think this would be doomed to failure.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 11 **Comment Id:** 337967 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: the plan is also a stunning waste of taxpayer dollars. This plan is designed to be litigated from here to forever, and, before this is all over, many millions of our hard earned cash will have been vaporized.

Organization:

Commenter: Marcel p Houtzager **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 38 **Comment Id:** 338003 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There is no reason for dogs to be banned from Ocean Beach. We're not talkin' the French Riviera here, or even Malibu. We're talking a beach that has very little traffic in a very large area. It's foggy and cool the majority of days. It's not going to be a regular bikini magnet until global warming takes hold in a big way, and that's not happening in near future. If you ban dogs from Ocean Beach and some of these other areas, all you're going to do is decrease traffic significantly, and have far less voter support for GGNRA/National Parks. It could become a real downward spiral for funding and lead to really unfortunate consequences for the parks' futures. Dogs on leash don't chase plovers. Most dogs off leash don't, either. But all the homeless encampments up there don't do a whole lot of good. And those sandmovers aren't helping them.

Organization:

Commenter: Maria Hanson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 137 **Comment Id:** 346294 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Policing new policies will cost $2.5 million dollars a year, a sum that seems a bit stupid given the budget issues and the fact that this would seem to run counter to general public wishes.

Organization:

Commenter: John C Weaver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 181 **Comment Id:** 349996 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Also please disclose how much money this change is costing us the tax payers.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean Templin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 194 **Comment Id:** 350087 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: . We should first and most have funds to get more Rangers to enforce dog leash policies. Rangers are the essence of our National Parks and their presence gives comfort and

good feeling.
Organization:
Commenter: nafiss griffis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 242 **Comment Id:** 350335 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Your preferred option for Muir Beach is terrible and poorly thought out. Your plan is unenforceable and will only create confusion and problems. Muir Beach is a dog walking destination and people come with the intent to let their dogs run off leash. Enforcing an on-leash rule will never happen and if NPS rangers actually show up at the beach to write tickets they'd be far better off writing tickets on Muir Woods road for parking.
Organization:
Commenter: Jason L Weisberger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 440 **Comment Id:** 351374 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: National Park ideas on regulations seem fair for all - however, law to administer the plans police citizens who need policing seems deficient
Organization:
Commenter: Diane Filbert **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 449 **Comment Id:** 351387 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Implementing any alternative other than A will be costly and time consuming. Increased regulation will only increase dollars spent.
Organization:
Commenter: Leah King **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1020 **Comment Id:** 351445 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My guess is that restrictions may be ignored by many, and policing dog policies is a poor use of NPS or local law enforcement resources.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard Haas **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 517 **Comment Id:** 351852 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Focus NPS resources on enforcing other things
Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1296 **Comment Id:** 352258 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Since this has been going on nothing has been done to repair walking trails or to remove sand from the trails. Is that because GGNRA wants NO ONE on the land? If dogs are not allowed off leash, the parking lot would be empty. Why can't you leave it the way it is and perhaps charge a small fee for upkeep?
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Gordon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1353 **Comment Id:** 352390 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Moreover, in this draft proposal for a new "dog management plan", I don't see any provision for adding "more resources" i.e. more officers to enforce your regulations. Did I miss it somewhere? Without that, how will you be able to enforce a new plan any better than you been able to enforce the current plan?
Organization:
Commenter: Steven Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 711 **Comment Id:** 353002 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Question #1: Exactly how many tax dollars did the DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN cost, out of curiosity?
Organization:
Commenter: Debby Lesser **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1579 **Comment Id:** 353146 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally using resources to enforce leash laws would take away from other more important social issues that could be addressed.
Organization:
Commenter: michael pattersom **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1632 **Comment Id:** 353226 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Lastly, I would like to address the economic sense of further restricting parks from dog friendly space. Any tightening of dog restrictions would naturally require additional resources for policing and enforcing said policies. With our park systems already under intense financial pressures (park closers, etc.), could our park dollars not be better spent reopening and

maintaining our parks system instead of degrading the experience of some the parks systems biggest advocates and supporters?

Organization:

Commenter: Katrina F Kehl **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 871 **Comment Id:** 353474 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Alternative E seems to have too much enforcement that will eventually negatively impact parks because of cost and lack of funds.

Organization:

Commenter: Kim H Krogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1683 **Comment Id:** 353584 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Finally, if the GGNRA cannot enforce laws already in place, how will they enforce new laws?

Organization:

Commenter: Tara T **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4599 **Comment Id:** 353840 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I oppose fences as both an eyesore, and, a ridiculous initial as well as on-going expense. Unusual regulations will only require unusual and expensive enforcement. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

Organization:

Commenter: Tom Long **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1976 **Comment Id:** 354639 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not only that, but exactly who is going to pay to police all these parks once the ban goes into effect?

Organization:

Commenter: Sasha Moyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2898 **Comment Id:** 355178 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It will cost money to reinforce such a plan and it is overwhelmingly ignorant of the wishes of the majority of Bay Area residents.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Kathleen Hughes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2043 **Comment Id:** 355467 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: However, I think the recent current dog proposal that heavily limits the areas that we can use for off leash walking of dogs is going to fundamentally change these parks for the worse. One of the best parts of living in San Francisco is access to these great parks, parks that we can share with our best furry legged friends. I highly urge you to reconsider this proposal that will take away from the recreation and enjoyment that many people in the city highly value. If not, I will have to withdraw my sustaining donation to these parks since I will no longer support the goals of the NPS and the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Tina J Huang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2105 **Comment Id:** 355708 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If you allow more areas for off leash dogs you will need more law enforcement to control irresponsible dog owners can't the limited resources of the Park Service be put to better use?
Organization:
Commenter: Norman Machado **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2623 **Comment Id:** 356917 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Currently there is a large amount of non-compliance in the area due to this heavy handed approach, this will only get worse with any of the proposals. I know from past experience with the Boy Scouts in maintenance and creation of trails, that when you have overly heavy trail regulation people lose respect for the authority and do not follow any of the rules. However if you allowed space and trails for everyone, people will be much more compliant, people will be happier and the environment will be happier.
Organization:
Commenter: John Negley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2824 **Comment Id:** 357562 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Places such as Fort Funstonnactually thrive because of the people who take their dogs there. If not for people walking their dogs almost nobody would enjoy that area.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeff Fielding **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2870 **Comment Id:** 357695 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I expect to see Fort Funston, Rodeo beach and many other beautiful recreational beach areas in the bay area start to resemble "ghost parks" if this new dog management plan goes through.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne-Marie Twomey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3294 **Comment Id:** 358054 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Eliminating off leash would likely reduce the overall usage of the park as pet owners go to the park to walk their dogs. Cant play fetch? Probably not going to the park.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3305 **Comment Id:** 358114 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Any tightening of dog restrictions would naturally require additional resources for policing and enforcing said policies. With our park systems already under intense financial pressures (park closings, etc.), could our park dollars not be better spent reopening and maintaining our parks system instead of degrading the experience of some the parks systems biggest advocates and supporters?
Organization:
Commenter: Mary L Bryant **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3358 **Comment Id:** 358230 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It appears that passing legislation would have higher, unnecessary costs than just keeping these areas of recreation at the status quo.
Organization:
Commenter: Allen Miao **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3390 **Comment Id:** 358312 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additional staff may be needed to clean up after them which also raises costs for the GGNRA unnecessarily.
Organization: Ms.
Commenter: laura woodford **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3824 **Comment Id:** 359913 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In short - STOP wasting my tax payments on this silliness unless your proposal includes a clear cost-benefit analysis that takes into consideration the economic effects of staffing, enforcement, and revenue generation. Do you have a plan for monitoring for compliance? How many employees will this include, and what will their salary be? What percentage of violations do you think will be noted, and what percentage of fines will actually be collected? On what basis do you make your estimates.

Organization:

Commenter: Geoff Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4562 **Comment Id:** 360651 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you will not let us do it there, we will have to do it in the city parks, which will be overrun. With dog walkers locked out(that is what you plan does, the areas we have been left will be intolerable due to overcrowding, and so we will have to go elsewhere), very few people will be out there using the land except on the days when it is hospitable, warm and beautiful. You will have the hang gliders, a few surfers, an occasional fisherman.

Organization:

Commenter: steve r hooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4669 **Comment Id:** 361300 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Enforcement of these regulations will cost money, and raise the ire of locals who will protest.

Organization:

Commenter: Noah Austin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4778 **Comment Id:** 361511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Dog Management Plan to further restrict areas where dogs are currently permitted in the GGNRA will discourage people from 1) exercising in these beautiful areas, and 2) will cause people to be less supportive of maintaining these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: T B **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4872 **Comment Id:** 361669 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Park Operations There is little difference in cost between Alternative E and Alternative F (Tables 32, 33, and 34). Detailed comparison shows that in fact estimated cost is exactly the same except in the areas of Visitor and Resource Protection and non-personnel costs. These differences are 11 percent and 8 percent, respectively (higher for Alternative E). Costs for both of these alternatives are substantially higher than Alternative A - No Action (4.5 to 5 times

higher). It is unclear how the difference in costs for the Visitor and Resource Protection Division between Alternative E and Alternative F were determined. In addition, it is unclear where funding will come from to pay for the overall increased cost. With overall federal funding for the NPS decreasing, it seems unlikely that five times current funding will be provided for GGNRA dog management.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynne Srinivasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5634 **Comment Id:** 364052 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The site should continue as it is. as a dog park to take our dogs to walk,play and socialize, on or off leash, throughout the park without proposed limitations. Today, it is rare that I see folks behaving badly, and I believe that the use of the park as is, and if it were able to continue as is, would actually be an asset to the site at Fort Funston, as well as the other sites. If it were to be changed as proposed, I believe there would be less visitors to the site, since most of the visitors are dog owners/walkers, and crime would likely return and become the problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth F Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5685 **Comment Id:** 364149 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is very important to socialize dogs like pitbulls, German Shepherds, huskies, etc. and if all interactions from a young age were stressful, on-leash encounters, I think more dogs would be aggressive when meeting other dogs out for a walk, pulling and barking and snapping. All that aside, the quality of life of many San Franciscans and their dogs will be greatly diminished by strict leash-laws, and the cost of enforcing it seems a bit ridiculous. We'd much rather have the parks nicely maintained, and let dog owners continue to do their own dog management as we have done for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Louise B Rousseau **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5740 **Comment Id:** 364207 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The fact is, currently it will cost a proposed 2 million dollars to populate all of the GGNRA parks with enough employees to police our dog walking, however that money should be used to address far greater problems first.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex M Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5877 **Comment Id:** 364449 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is unnecessary to spend this kind of money trying to enforce an leash required dog park.

Organization:

Commenter: Ivan C. **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5897 **Comment Id:** 364496 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It seems that it would cost the Par Service much more money to enforce such restrictions that it would to keep this service intact as is. Where are dog owners supposed to go? There are nearly 100,000 dogs in a city that already has limited space.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrei Ferrera **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5901 **Comment Id:** 364504 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Also, there are only a limited number of rangers available whose time could be better spent on more serious matters.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6087 **Comment Id:** 365395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: So, if I understand this correctly, the Park Service is interested in imposing new rules and regulations that will severely limit the use of the GGNRA by the local population, and will need a 5x increase in staff in order to implement and enforce these new restrictive policies. A consequence of this proposal will be 5X more park service staff wandering about in the GGNRA writing tickets and otherwise interfering with the use of the park by a smaller and smaller number of citizens.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6307 **Comment Id:** 365469 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Despite the hassles created by the status quo, I suspect Option A is the lowest cost option as I question whether NPS has (or should have) sufficient resources to enforce greater restriction than presently exists. I believe limited resources could be better spent attending to basic safety, education, and other purposes. I recognize that, presently, time is devoted issues and difficulties related to dogs but enforcing more restrictive options poses on a constant battle that I think is imprudent to pursue.

Organization:

Commenter: Marc H Lavine **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365502 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In fact, each of the proposed alternatives will cost between $2M and $3M to implement, as compared to the $400K for present operations. Therefore, the proposed preferred alternatives will degrade park operations, requiring hiring of significantly more staff, and increase the costs of the entire operation. How can it be that the proposals are "improvements" if a clear consequence is that 5X MORE staff are required to operate under those proposals? Isn't the outcome expected by the NPS in its own reporting the EXACT OPPOSITE of this objective?
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6660 **Comment Id:** 365769 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting recreational use will decrease the use of the Park, which is a tragedy.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Koch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6346 **Comment Id:** 365783 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Even if there are enough patrols to protect birds during relatively good economic times, the new regulations must be realistic and take into account the inevitable budget cuts. How will they affect the ability to enforce the boundaries, especially if dogs can go on some parts of the beach and not others? Right now, on Ocean Beach at least, this isn't working at all. I don't think most dog owners are serious about self-policing, so I think if dogs are allowed on any part of the beach, this is an abdication to the dogs in the long run, unless the dogs are in an enclosed area with specific, visual boundaries (fences).
Organization:
Commenter: lyn stein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6374 **Comment Id:** 365812 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If this use was eliminated, the beach areas of Crissy Field would experience a dramatic reduction in use - this may be the goal of the policies preferred by the park service, but this would be a truly sad loss of public use and enjoyment of these lands.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6515 **Comment Id:** 367642 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In the Draft Dog Management Plan, the authors cite the confusion about policy that arises because dog-walking rules in the GGNRA are different than the rules in other national parks. The report makes the argument that there will be less confusion on this topic if the policy in the GGNRA is consistent with the policy in other national parks. This perspective ignores a many-year history of these policies in the GGNRA, and the significant local confusion that will be caused by a sudden and dramatic policy change. The plan also points to costs associated with this confusion, and the need for park staff to spend time and energy explaining this unique local policy. However, this argument ignores the significant cost that will be associated with implementation of a policy change, and the need for the staff to deal with the local confusion that will be caused by the policy change. I noticed that the report indicates that the implementation of a policy change will require somewhere between $2M and $3M in staffing expenses, which is significantly more than the $430,000 presently spend on staff in these parks. So, a change in policy will probably lead to increased confusion about policy, and even the draft report indicates that the increased confusion associated with the new policy will require a significant increase in staffing and costs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6644 **Comment Id:** 368170 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Restricting recreation use will decrease the use of the Park, which is a tragedy.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathryn Nyrop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4404 **Comment Id:** 368477 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I understand that in this political climate it is hard to get funding, but I hope these dog laws are not to raise money from tickets.

Organization:

Commenter: patrick ridge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6459 **Comment Id:** 368555 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We encourage the Park Service to embody habitat and resource protection as the primary focus of the strategy guidelines. We also note with concern the Park Service's acknowledgment of limited staffing resources, and encourage NPS to recognize those sites where it has insufficient resources to adequately protect the park from either on-leash or off-leash dog impacts and eliminate those sites as areas where dogs are allowed.

Organization: San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Commenter: Steven Krefting **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6536 **Comment Id:** 368841 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The policy changes will require a significant increase in cost and staff
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/02/2014)

PS1000 Comment Regarding Public Scoping Process (Substantive)

1. **Commenters did not feel that the NPS sufficiently considered and incorporated public comment. As a result, many commenters expressed the belief that the public comment process was simply for show. One commenter noted that the NPS must not consider fewer comments representative of less dissatisfaction.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1488 **Comment Id:** 352898 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However, if we can, I would like to make the point that GGNRA should not be allowed to make the argument if the number of comments decrease on this second SEIS, this indicates any less dissatisfaction. You must consider several other reasons why the number of comments may decrease, e.g,.: * The 2nd draft (SEIS) clearly ignored the comments from the 1st, so many are disenchanted with the process and believe it is a waste of time. * In general, it is hard enough to get people to find time to make a comment. To ask them to make multiple is exponentially more difficult. * Some now want to boycott this process by refusing to participate.

Organization:

Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2933 **Comment Id:** 355235 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This plan was put together with minimal input and feedback from the general public. Only special interest groups who are already skilled at this type of process really got to give input fairly.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Sara O'Hearn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2964 **Comment Id:** 355275 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The policies that are being set forth are too restrictive and the GGNRA is not listening to the vast majority of people who are responding to this who are against their restrictions. This is recreational land, not Mt. Rushmore or The Grand Canyon.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Merrick Wolfe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2738 **Comment Id:** 357155 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Over the years, I have participated in the planning process for the Dog

Management Plan, have testified at many meetings about it, sat on the rule making committee, and written many comments letters. During this entire process I feel my point of view, as well as those of tens of thousands of other dog owners, have been completely ignored by the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Carol J Arnold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4549 **Comment Id:** 360560 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe the supporters of this effort are not going to be as loud as the opposition so I sincerely hope that the NPS take into consideration the years of formalized complaints filed by families of children who have been bitten, elderly who cannot safely walk down the street, beach-goers who cannot find a clean spot to lay their blanket, and cannot sit without fear that a dog is going to charge at their children.

Organization:

Commenter: Rachel Holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6638 **Comment Id:** 367565 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The entire process has been so disheartening that I almost decided to forgo this last ditch comment period because it's increasingly clear that support for pets has continued to relentlessly gnaw away at any semblance of wildlife protection in the GGNRA. There's no question that Mike Lynes' statement is absolutely accurate ' wildlife continues to be pushed aside by the alarmingly boisterous and well-organized dog booster groups, as well as most politicians and newspaper publishers who all seem to confuse affection for pets with concern for wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: M. B Grosjean **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters cited issues with public notification, ease of access and availability to the document and comment forms, the size of the document, and other issues. Many commenters mentioned either support or dislike of the extension of the public comment process.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 204 **Comment Id:** 350107 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The comment period runs from September to January, how come the announcement poster was posted only for one day? Are you afraid to let people know what is going on?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 439 **Comment Id:** 351372 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: You have done a poor job of informing Fort Funston users of your proposed changes.
Organization:
Commenter: Vicky Schulman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1171 **Comment Id:** 351885 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I was also confused by the email I received a couple weeks ago stating it contained a PDF link to the new proposed plan. I tried to find it, but only found that the plan is in public libraries? Really, is that true? In this time of technological wonder you can't send out the plan? One has to go to the library. This seems like a very bad idea and a decision that will keep many people from reading the long-awaited plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Douglas Holsclaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1182 **Comment Id:** 351930 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When you refer to "continued concern" of some stakeholders for the reason to again extend the comment period I hope you realize how that comes off as less then credible. Shame on you for caving into the "progressive" politics of the city and the bully tactics of the dog community by giving them even more time to ruin the experience for the rest of us in the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Miriam Moss **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 893 **Comment Id:** 353603 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: My main observation, however, is that the Dog Management Plan document is simply overwhelming. I can't imagine how anyone has the bandwidth to really take in all this information. Unless one is an attorney and used to dealing with such massive documents, I don't think the average person can absorb it all. Perhaps a summary document with the important points and summarized options would be useful.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2877 **Comment Id:** 354890 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally, the public com ment period is ineffective because it requires citizens to make com ments in a cumbersome and time-consuming manner.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Booh Edouardo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5020 **Comment Id:** 362023 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: it is nearly impossible to wade through the 2,200 page document to make sense of it or find any of the required foundation or support for decisions
Organization:
Commenter: Genevieve Coyle **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4373 **Comment Id:** 364129 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Lastly, Little if anything has been done to make the public aware of this plan, when so many will be negatively effected. If it were not for the email I received from friends with pets that are aware of the GGNRAs actions and intents. I have seen ZERO information regarding this plan. So how many other pet owners do not even know to respond or comment. Please consider this when you are counting the responses you receive..
Organization:
Commenter: Judie L Doherty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. Commenters discussed issues with the public meetings held by NPS. Several commenters were afraid to attend meetings for their safety; some commenters noted that the times meetings were held were not convenient; some had comments on the meeting materials and format.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1171 **Comment Id:** 351884 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The fact is I am afraid to attend your meetings, anyway, because of how aggressive dog-owners are in shouting people down whose ideas they don't like.I would come to your meeting if I could find a copy of your policy and if you could assure my safety if I expressed these opinions. Can you guarantee the safety of a non dog owner? Let me know.
Organization:
Commenter: Douglas Holsclaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1181 **Comment Id:** 351927 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Trying to attend dog meetings to put forth my point of views is too scary. I have been to the dog policy meetings in San Francisco and they boo and hiss at you. They call you names and are out of control. It is a mob mentality.
Organization:
Commenter: Miriam A Moss **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1352 **Comment Id:** 352386 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is truly astonishing after all of this time developing the DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN that GGNRA has made the decision to hold an informational meeting about the Plan in San Francisco during working hours! Not on the coast during the evening when the people who are affected by the Plan can actually attend and have input.

Organization:

Commenter: Debby Lesser **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1910 **Comment Id:** 354528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The NPS say they are open for comments and suggestions - - but I'm not so sure. The Open House held on Jan 30th 2014 was supposed to run until 12:30 pm. But by 11:45 am is was all packed-up and in boxes! Another example of the NPS pay lip-service to listening to comments, but really just pushing through their preferred plans at the expense of all dog owners and dog lovers.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5308 **Comment Id:** 362944 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On a rainy night in January of 2001 I was among 2000 Bay Area citizens who came to protest the GGNRA/NPAs decision to rescind the 1979 Pet Policy which would end off leash dog walking recreation throughout the GGNRA. Many of us were standing outside in the rain because the venue you selected for this event was too small to accomodate all of us inside. It was not a good night to be stuck outside. But this meeting was so important to each one of us that despite the rain, cold and darkness, we did not leave.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean Kind **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2420 **Comment Id:** 368514 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have to say, I've been to several public information meetings. And one thing I don't like about the GGNRA's presentation is that the diagrams you had at your public meetings did not show before and after representations of the areas you are seeking to change. So it's difficult to imagine the entirety of what is potentially changing. But it's clear that I will be losing public-access areas to recreate

Organization:

Commenter: bill randt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. Commenters made suggestions for the public comment period. Suggestions included holding a vote, and creating a forum for groups to discuss recreation management.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1413 **Comment Id:** 352505 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: How about you put this to a vote (this IS America, isn't it?) instead of imposing your authority on the public? Does ANYTHING that we (the dog-loving public) say even matter at this point? Surely does not feel like it.

Organization:

Commenter: Marc Gilliland **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1566 **Comment Id:** 353113 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this is truly a democratic society than let the people vote and then stick with that decision. If the people of Marin actually vote to accept less space for off-leash play for their dogs than I'll eat my words and move to a more dog-friendly location. But I think the GGNRA will be eating dog biscuits instead. Take it to the people!

Organization:

Commenter: Laura N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357068 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A proper forum should be set up to review recreation management and should include dog walkers and other park users such as cyclists, equestrians, hikers, and surfers and sail boarders. This type of committee would be valuable for the GGNRA in order to hear directly from their users and to engender their support in maintaining the GGNRA lands through volunteer opportunities supporting collective access.

Organization:

Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2509 **Comment Id:** 359009 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Suggestion: Can you make the link to this Comments page easier to locate on your website? Currently, it is necessary to follow links or drill down to find the comment page. Perhaps you can make the link stand out somehow with bold text in a different size or color?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5711 **Comment Id:** 364181 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly urge the NPS staff hold an *actual* public collaborative process to balance the needs of the local population with regards to the use of these areas.

Organization:
Commenter: Kate N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5751 **Comment Id:** 364234 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would also like to see a real public notification process, with posting at trails that are affected or having a mailing list so that the public can stay up to date on the changes.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Gahry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364805 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Take a poll or vote of local residents on whether your proposed dog restrictions are merited. Posting signs and websites is not sufficient outreach for a change this impactful on the lives and health benefits to local residents. I submit the local users of Rancho will deny the need for dog restrictions - but might heartily endorse restrictions on mountain bikes
Organization:
Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

5. Commenters were satisfied with the public comment process. They felt that the comment period was extensive, and that the meeting format was successful.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 3621 **Comment Id:** 359263 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The Special Rule that the park has devised for these lands is intended to meet some of the traditional needs of one group of park users. It cannot meet all of their desires. The Special Rule has had extensive public process. The park's administration has worked with the public for 13 years to craft regulations for dog owners that will give them opportunities not granted elsewhere in the National Park System.
Organization:
Commenter: Amy W Meyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5677 **Comment Id:** 364114 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have attended several of the open houses and found your staff helpful and the general tone of the conversation to be positive and constructive even among folks with differing opinions.
Organization:
Commenter: Chris M Apicella **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

GGNRA160633

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 107 **Comment Id:** 343884 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If you read the public comments to the 2011 plan, you will see that the majority of comments were opposed to any further restrictions on dogs. The new draft under consideration now in 2013 must incorporate that earlier public input. That's how the process works, you know, democracy, due process, responsive government. The lip service of just taking comments is not sufficient; you have to actually incorporate the comments into the subsequent revision. Otherwise, the dog-owning lawyers will come forward armed with the claim that public input was not appropriately considered. They are already taking notes, planning strategy, and drafting letters. The entire 2013 draft and any subsequent rules will be thrown out in court, and we will have to start this entire process over all together. Actually, I think that already played out once before about 5 years ago when the park rangers started suddenly giving out tickets for off-leash dogs without taking any public comment. A federal judge threw out the tickets and the entire new policy due to lack of public input, and that is what started the whole process of creating these draft plans. It seems that we are going to repeat that all over again. So the best option today is to retract the 2013 draft, then review the comments to the 2011 plan, and come up with a new and better draft which fully incorporates public comments. Based on the 2011 public comments, it seems that dogs will need to have the same if not more space allowed off-leash, and other people who do not want to be around dogs deserve to have signs to tell them where those areas already exist which ban dogs (the vast majority of the GGNRA and the Bay Area). Really at this point I should point out that the Park Service has failed to effectively administer a public comment process. It's not that complicated. But it has taken them many years to get this far, only to get thrown back to square one. Probably they are just doing all of this to keep busy and protect their budget, in this era of federal budget cuts. Either way, it is just a great example of government waste.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 137 **Comment Id:** 346292 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to voice my frustration at the proposed new restrictions. I believe the NPS is simply going through the motions of soliciting public comment on dog policy. It is quite apparent that you intend nothing short of radically changing the areas where dogs are allowed off leash.

Organization:

Commenter: John C Weaver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 196 **Comment Id:** 350091 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This is not being run as a democratic process - - the input you received clearly shows that the public is not on the side of these increased restrictions. If you have any doubt about this I suggest the issue be put to a public vote.

Organization:
Commenter: Bryce Goodman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1074 **Comment Id:** 351529 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I hate to see the public taken for fools as you "extend the comments period". Give me break. It's a charade called promoting false hope.
Organization:
Commenter: JOE STRANZL **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1286 **Comment Id:** 352268 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I question that you truly "welcome" comments about the off leash dog issue. So far you have totally ignored the extensive comments.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard D Carrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1443 **Comment Id:** 352569 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I apologize if you find some of my comments similar to comments on the previous Draft DMP/EIS. The web-based "Comment Response Report" was entirely too cumbersome to be practical. In any event, it appears that most comments were not taken seriously, because the GGNRA's preferred alternative for Rancho Corral de Tierra (Rancho) in the current Draft DMP/SEIS still does not allow sufficient opportunity for recreational dog walking.
Organization: Montara Dog Group
Commenter: William R Bechtell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 641 **Comment Id:** 352799 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please extend the public comment period. With the government shutdown and the holidays, there has not been sufficient time to make the public aware of the plan or for the public to provide comments.
Organization:
Commenter: Arnita Bowman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1621 **Comment Id:** 353214 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The proposed changes you outline in your dog management plan seem to ignore the concerns and suggestions of a large number of public commentators. I do not see the

comments of dog owners adequately reflected in your proposed use plans. Because your plans do not include balanced options for the public to vote on, including options that increase access to the area by all segments of the community, I do not believe the issue has been adequately evaluated. I do not support any change to the current use rule, mandated and set out at the time of the grant of lands in 1979.

Organization:

Commenter: Sue-Ellen speight **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1736 **Comment Id:** 353715 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: After reading it, and it took some time to find, I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Organization: Northern California Shiba Rescue

Commenter: Warren R Printz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4490 **Comment Id:** 353837 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. This is a perversion of the public comment process and reflects a worrisome government intrusion into areas that are supposed to be reserved for the benefit of the people and their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Heather P Kulp **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4836 **Comment Id:** 353853 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Chris Muir **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1822 **Comment Id:** 354151 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to express dismay not only about the proposed dog plan about the odd ways in which the information is presented and the autocratic ways in which the National Park Service has acted. On October 21, 2013, the National Park Service simply did not attend a hearing because they didn't want to the hear the perspectives of those that do not agree with

them.
Organization:
Commenter: Nada Djordjevich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1902 **Comment Id:** 354511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Judging by the lack of response to an overwhelming amount of resistance to this plan, you at GGNRA are likely to ignore all reason and will proceed with this hateful plan, no matter what the general public says.
Organization:
Commenter: Bailey Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2893 **Comment Id:** 355031 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I was shocked to learn about a proposal by the GGNRA to severely limit dogs and off-leash dog walking in Ft. Funston, Crissy Field and other parks -.-. especially as it didn't take into account any of the views or opinions of the public: the people who live and work in this city.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Chantelle Karl **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2933 **Comment Id:** 355236 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also, public com ment periods are ineffective and demand too much from the public creating a real lack in access to our government agencies and departments.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Sara O'Hearn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2954 **Comment Id:** 355263 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it was put forward by NPS/GGNRA and was not formulated with any input by the public except for special interest groups privy to access this agency. It stands to restrict public access to NPS/GGNRA areas.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Rachel Wolan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2965 **Comment Id:** 355277 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Consider all of the public com ments that have been submitted; not s.elect.ive

one.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Russell Colunga **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2985 **Comment Id:** 355316 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This draft plan has received no public input and seriously makes no sense.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Bill Worthen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3025 **Comment Id:** 355374 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The Dog Mgmt Plan put forward by NPS/GGNRA was not formulated with any input by the public except for special interest groups privy to access this agency.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Sara Silberschatz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3025 **Comment Id:** 355375 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also, public com ment periods are ineffective and demand too much from the public creating a real lack in access to our government agencies and departments
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Sara Silberschatz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3912 **Comment Id:** 355668 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it was not formulated with any input by the public except for special interest groups privy to access this agency.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: James Wilson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3912 **Comment Id:** 355669 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If NPS felt a need to have it u.pdate.d or changed, the same process needed to be activated. Public com ment, overwhelmingly opposed to this plan from what I have seen, was not heeded by the agency.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: James Wilson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2610 **Comment Id:** 356876 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Each and every person who is taking advantage of the GGNRA over a period of time should be given a say in this process!
Organization:
Commenter: Stacey Sobel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2681 **Comment Id:** 357049 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: People are not aware of what is happening - - bring this before the public and you wouldn't dare pass these restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jane Milotich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6657 **Comment Id:** 357111 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: They also don't realize that many of us are afraid of our neighbors who own pitt bulls and other large, sometimes aggressive dogs and would be affraid to go to a public meeting and take them on.
Organization:
Commenter: Julia Thomas **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4521 **Comment Id:** 360473 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I know that the NPS has heard numerous comments opposing these changes. I find it disturbing that our needs as a community are being ignored.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Wilder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4550 **Comment Id:** 360578 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Part of the appeal to living in California and San Francisco is the access to parks and the beach. Being able to take my dogs out and get regular exercise benefits both my physical and mental health. It is greatly discouraging to have felt that all talks and negotiations were completely disregarded when this new draft was put forward with very few changes in place.
Organization:
Commenter: Dusty Lombardo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4595 **Comment Id:** 361107 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The first time, mine, and many other comments were disregarded.
Organization:
Commenter: Natalie D DeWitt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4790 **Comment Id:** 361537 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Many thousands of people have submitted concerns and objections to the new plan, yet all of these citizens have been ignored.
Organization:
Commenter: Glen Kretmar **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4791 **Comment Id:** 361540 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA needs to consider the comments and suggestions made by local residents - serving the public in an urban area is the organization's reason for existing.
Organization: retired
Commenter: Ann Sasaki **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4907 **Comment Id:** 361762 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SF is a city full of loving responsible dog-owners, and I don't understand why this new plan doesn't reflect the importance of our feedback... not to mention there haven't been any peer-reviewed, site-specific study, as required by law, to support such a draconian measure.
Organization:
Commenter: Barry R Perlman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5179 **Comment Id:** 362462 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog owners are responsible and clean up after their dogs and it is incredulous that the City is trying to pass this measure without fully taking into account the opinions of dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Charlotte Shropshire **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5198 **Comment Id:** 362576 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: At least hold the draft for a bit longer or talk to me directly. Would love to

attend your meetings.

Organization:

Commenter: Ryan P Witwicki Faddegon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5307 **Comment Id:** 362941 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please seriously consider the above comments and help those of us who are older or physically limited. We cherish our dogs and their companionship and want them to be able to benefit from off-leash areas in the GGNRA where they can get the exercise and play time they so deserve.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan L Damron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5340 **Comment Id:** 362991 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this plan goes forward witout any apparent accomodation of dog owners it will C) sadly it gives an impression of GGNRAas bullies - requesting comments and then ignoring a vocal community

Organization:

Commenter: Mary Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5597 **Comment Id:** 363982 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Well, I am not sure how many times we have to comment on your plan for dog access in the GGNRA before you hear what the citizens of the United States want from OUR Recreation Areas.

Organization: Spring Street Farms

Commenter: Susan I Shea **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5677 **Comment Id:** 364115 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I hope that this public comment process is a productive one. I read many non-productive comments after the last version of the DEIS in opposition to making any changes whatsoever. There are very organized groups such as Ocean Beach Dog and Crissy Field Dog actively engaged in trying to sabotage this process as much as possible.

Organization:

Commenter: Chris M Apicella **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5996 **Comment Id:** 364871 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please listen to your constituents. It sort of feels like these decisions get made in a vacuum and the GGNRA is just going through the motions this restrictive, unfair and unreasonble plan happen.

Organization:

Commenter: Nina Steinman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365363 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS continually quotes from comments received that uphold its own viewpoint that dog walking is a negative use, yet fails to quote the much higher percentage of comments that refute the plan's proposals and uphold the validity of existing uses and the lack of need for any change.

Organization:

Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6121 **Comment Id:** 365476 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I wish that the GGNRA planners would work WITH dog owners, as county officials did in Redmond, WA, where they allotted 150 acres as an off-leash dog park, maintained completely by volunteers, and eventually funded with a small parking fee. Instead, it feels as though the comment periods are a perfunctory step in a process that has a foregone conclusion, namely that of drastically reducing off-leash dog exercise/recreation areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate Hellenga **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6142 **Comment Id:** 365602 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm appalled that after all of these many years, draft plans and redrafted plans and delays, GGNRA's proposed Dog Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement pays so little attention to the public's input. In fact, with each iteration, GGNRA's gets more restrictive and less responsive.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert A Dewey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6415 **Comment Id:** 366974 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In no way do I consider this to be public comment because there was no way to respond in an open forum, At all the meetings I attended public comment was not allowed. All we have is the word of the park service that they will read this and may publish the text. Why are the posts allowed to be anonymous? Why is there no link to comments as they are written?

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher w Gove **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367545 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This issue was highlighted for me recently when I looked at some older documents relating to this issue and found a resolution from 2006 from some members of the Negotiated Rulemaking committee sent to the Committee facilitators and it struck me that the same issues that we were concerned with in 2006 are still relevant today. Clearly, this failure to incorporate substantive comments into the preferred alternative indicates that NPS/GGNRA is focused on what outcome it wants, not what the public at large is saying.
Organization:
Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6635 **Comment Id:** 367558 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And I am very upset that again we must take precious time to write supervisors and congressional representatives when the GGNRA ignored all the substantive comments supporting dogs and opposing the same plan two years ago. I dont understand why you wont work with the dog people to resolve any problems there may be.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrea Patterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6686 **Comment Id:** 369058 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Clearly precedent and the government's decision to utilize the notice and comment process here confirm this proposed change to the DMP is both highly controversial and will have a major impact upon visitor use patterns in the GGNRA. Peer review is required in this circumstance, and the SEIS acknowledges such.)
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369450 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Further, Closures at Fort Funston were conducted without a NEPA required environmental impact analysis with regards to recreation or the Bank Swallows, without proper project approval, without peer review, and without public hearings in violation of NPS regulations, U. S. Department of Interior management policies, and federal law. The GGNRA has implemented similar closures at Baker Beach, Lobos Creek, and in the Presidio. Concerned citizens were unable to obtain specific vegetative plans for the Presidio. Eventually plans to cut down approximately 4,000 trees in order to plant a native "vinegarweed" (lessingia) came to light and were opposed vigorously.

Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/02/2014)

PS1200 Park Response to Public Comments on January 2011 DEIS (Substantive)

1. **Commenters stated that despite overwhelming comments against the DEIS or suggesting changes to the DEIS, no significant changes were made in the SEIS. Many commenters felt that the comments on the DEIS were largely ignored, particularly those of the dog walking community.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 82 **Comment Id:** 339916 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

Organization:

Commenter: Bill Cole **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 286 **Comment Id:** 350474 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As far as I can see reading the proposed documentation for the NPS Dog Plan, the NPS has ignored the majority opinion in resisting the curtailment of people walking their dogs and enjoying a healthy activity. The NPS can't have failed to grasp, after the last round of scoping, that the majority of people want to be able to walk their dogs off leash in more areas than the NPS currently propose. Further this latest round of recommended legislation is even more restrictive than the NPS's initial scope. What is the point of spending the government's money to seek opinion if that opinion is to be utterly ignored? What is the point of seeking our opinion a second and third time to only ignore the majority will?

Organization:

Commenter: Betsy DeFries **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 605 **Comment Id:** 352707 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA's first "dog management" was roundly criticized 3 to 1 in public comments against it and opposed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Yet almost three years later, the GGNRA has now released a new plan that is identical to the original with insignificant, meaningless changes.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1621 **Comment Id:** 353214 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed changes you outline in your dog management plan seem to ignore the concerns and suggestions of a large number of public commentators. I do not see the comments of dog owners adequately reflected in your proposed use plans. Because your plans do not include balanced options for the public to vote on, including options that increase access to the area by all segments of the community, I do not believe the issue has been adequately evaluated. I do not support any change to the current use rule, mandated and set out at the time of the grant of lands in 1979.

Organization:

Commenter: Sue-Ellen speight **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2902 **Comment Id:** 355183 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... SEIS did not adequately consider com ments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these com ments (e.g., negative impacts on com munity and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred a.lter.native. The SEIS lists many, many com ments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS com ment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Com ments supporting dog walking were not used.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: james white **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4122 **Comment Id:** 362050 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Duane Ernst **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5224 **Comment Id:** 362691 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I almost feel it is useless to submit any public comment on the SDEIS, since the GGNRA failed to address the previous substantive comments submitted in favor of off-leash, in

favor by an overwhelming majority. The well-researched submission from Crissy Field Dog, SFDOG and others were brushed off. So much of the GGNRA's DEIS response referred back to their faulty errors in the original document, and only a few insignificant changes were made.

Organization:

Commenter: K Hu **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Comments on the 2011 DEIS represented individuals with many viewpoints, including individuals who did not own dogs. Commenters noted areas where comments were addressed in the SEIS.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 111 **Comment Id:** 345827 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If you read through the comments of the previous EIR, you will notice a lot of different viewpoints. Though the dog lobby often yells the loudest, there are others that want to use and enjoy these resources as well. They have made very logical and compelling arguments for some sort of balance between different users.

Organization:

Commenter: Chris M Apicella **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6645 **Comment Id:** 368192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The City of Pacifica had previously provided comments on the Draft Dog Management PIan/EIS in 2011 (copy attached). Thank you for modifying the preferred alternative for Mori Point by adding the Pollywog Trail as an on-leash trail. We also appreciate the modification of the preferred alternative for Sweeney Ridge/Cattle Hill to add on-leash dog walking at Sweeney Ridge on Sneath Lane and on the Baquiano Trail from Fassler Avenue to, and including, the Farallon View Trail.

Organization: Pacifica City Council

Commenter: Mary Nihart **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. An analysis of the impacts to nearby parks was requested in 2011 by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, but this has not been completed by the NPS. Commenters also noted issues with the NPS addressing comments from the USEPA.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1100 **Comment Id:** 351637 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. I am sure that places like Stern Grove will be inundated with dogs if the preferred alternative is

implemented.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea L Buffa **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1315 **Comment Id:** 352295 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption

Organization:

Commenter: mary nelson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1636 **Comment Id:** 353231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4373 **Comment Id:** 364126 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA.

Organization:

Commenter: Judie L Doherty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. Commenters noted that the SEIS used comments against dog walking to implement more restrictions, but did not use comments supporting dog walking. One commenter suggested that the comments from commenters on the previous process should be considered in the SEIS, and another stated that the NPS did not adequately respond to his comment as an individual concern statement.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1414 **Comment Id:** 352512 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking

were used to argue for more restrictions.SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Maya A De La Rosa-Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5552 **Comment Id:** 363938 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am dismayed that the SEIS contained only very minor changes from the DEIS, despite the significant number of public comments which opposed the plan. It appears that the GGNRA intended to severely limit off-leash dog access all along and has not operated in good faith to represent both sides. Of the 4,700 public comments the GGNRA says they received, they do not say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported off-leash dog walking. However, the SEIS over-represents comments from people who oppose off-leash dog walking and under-represents comments from those who support off-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6261 **Comment Id:** 366313 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Thousands of Bay Area citizens responded in prior Golden Gate National Recreation Area comment periods. To be fair, their numbers should also be counted in the tally of respondees for this current comment period.

Organization: Dogpatch Dogs

Commenter: Carma J Keats **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5457 **Comment Id:** 368650 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My letter is documented in Appendix A of the Public Comment Summary Report for the GGNRA Dog Management Plan/EIS dated September 2011 as Correspondence 2295 (first letter within the Appendix). I was disheartened to find out that none of my comments were adequately addressed in the Supplemental EIS, and that it appears that none of my comments would be responded to on an individual basis. It was my understanding, per Appendix A of this document, that this appendix contains letters coded differently than others due to the nature of the comments. These letters were not assigned codes as the majority of the letters

contained detailed comments referring to specific text within the Draft EIS. Instead responses will be prepared for each letter individually. I am requesting that the GGNRA explain why they did not follow through with responding to the correspondence contained in Appendix A on an individual basis.

Organization:

Commenter: Brett Becker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369638 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE SEIS DOES NOT INCLUDE A SUMMARY OF THE DEIS COMMENTS Both the SEIS and the DEIS Comment Response Report mention the total number of comments about the DEIS that they received (over 4,700 pieces of correspondence). Neither document gives an overall summary of the comments - how many comments opposed the GGNRAs Dog Management Plan? How many supported it? How many supported off-leash dog walking? How many opposed it? The DEIS Comment Response Report does include a list of sample comments to give a flavor of the overall comments, but there is no tally of how common those comment were. The description of public comments on the ANPR on p. 9 of the SEIS indicates that 71% of the respondents favored off-leash dog walking at selected sites in the GGNRA. This allows you to get an overall sense of the public comment and to put it in some kind of context. There is no similar overall summary of the public comment on the DEIS. An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that they were overwhelmingly opposed to the GGNRAs proposed Dog Management Plan and overwhelmingly supportive of dog walking, including off-leash. You would never know that, however, from reading either the SETS or the DEIS Comment Response Report. Every time there has been public comment (the ANPR, the DEIS), it favors dog walking, yet the GGNRA continues to push to restrict access for people with dogs against the will of the people.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. Commenters stated that the lack of site-specific evidence was not addressed, and the NPS did not provide the numbers of commenters who supported and opposed the plan in the SEIS.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 4473 **Comment Id:** 356010 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS never gives results of public com ment on the DEIS (neither does the "Response to DEIS Com ments by the GGNRA" document on the GGNRA website). They say they received over 4,700 com ments, but never say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS says: "NPS received many public com ments com plaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas." (p. 100). But there's no indication of how many negative com ments were actually made. An independent analysis of the DEIS com ments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Theresa Gaydon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4898 **Comment Id:** 361731 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is a disappointment to me that this anti-dog agenda has extended to the inadequate response of the SEIS to comments made by those in favor of dog walking. What is incredible is that of the 4700 comments obtained on the DEIS, there has been no disclosure of how many were for and how many against. What is the purpose of seeking opinions when they are not released and have no chance of impacting the policy or impacting public opinion? Is it merely to give window dressing to prescribed process?
Organization:
Commenter: sanford goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4975 **Comment Id:** 361883 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I also object to the lack of accounting of and response to the extensive comments that were made to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Of the 4700 comments how many supported off leash use? How many support restrictions? Such extraordinary restrictions require extraordinary proof. None of the comments and suggestions (such as time restrictions at Baker Beach) were mentioned.
Organization: Sierra Club
Commenter: Annemarie A Donjacour **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6142 **Comment Id:** 365604 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) does not adequately consider comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS. It reports more than 4,700 comments were received, but says nothing about how many comments were in support or opposition. Shouldn't public sentiment be reported and considered?
Organization:
Commenter: Robert A Dewey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367970 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: You encourage us to "focus [our] comments on the changes in the draft planJSEIS that were made as a result of comments on the 2011 draft EIS" (1), but these changes

are so minimal, compared to the extraordinary destruction of dog-walking access in both the draft and supplemental EIS, that one must focus on the fact that you have disregarded the overwhelming opposition to your "Preferred Alternative", reflected in thousands of responses to the DEIS. It is instructive that the SEIS never explicitly states the numbers opposed to the DEIS or the reasons for that opposition in clear qualitative or quantitative form. One is given "sample comments", whether they are representative of many, few or one. From the data that are available, one may posit that you are disregarding the profound negative response to your "preferred alternative". For example, of the respondents who made what you consider "substantive" comments regarding Fort Funston, only 33 supported your plan. On the other hand, 522 substantive responses opposed the plan. Another 271 responses suggested other alternatives, or changes in proposed alternatives 2. These figures alone should have sent the GGNRA back to the drawing board for a rethink of the importance and value of dog walking in the GGNRA. but instead resulted in only minor changes to that same benighted and disastrous "preferred alternative".

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 97 **Comment Id:** 339930 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The 2013 dog management plan is terrible. Please don't implement it! You basically ignored public comment on the 2011 version.

Organization:

Commenter: Russ Cohn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 134 **Comment Id:** 346288 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: So disappointing that you so ignored the biggest voice of response.

Organization:

Commenter: Carolyn Gereau **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 157 **Comment Id:** 349890 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: When your last proposal came out, I and many others wrote expressing our concerns about it. Unfortunately it appears that public input was largely ignored. This lengthly proposal seems to be based on a dislike of dogs, rather than facts.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah S Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 276 **Comment Id:** 350454 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

Organization:

Commenter: Rachel Frederick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 387 **Comment Id:** 351299 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have submitted many comments in the past (as have many others), and what I see and would like to point out is that all of them are ignored. Not just mine either. Comments the last time around were overwhenlmingly against this plan, and that hasn't caused you to change it at all.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 399 **Comment Id:** 351317 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It appears NPS is ignoring public comment. Show us that GGNRA will listen to the public.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 409 **Comment Id:** 351331 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: You are taking our comments & not hearing what we are telling you and asking for. You have had an agenda of your own all along and have not moved off your position.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 438 **Comment Id:** 351370 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: You heard the public comment - - the fury - - the resulted from the publication of your plan the last time. And instead of listening to what the people who actually use these areas with their dogs need, you've instead tightened the plan to be even more restrictive.
Organization:
Commenter: Jenny Johnston **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 942 **Comment Id:** 351410 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: b. b. **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1048 **Comment Id:** 351480 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Colleen Russell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1082 **Comment Id:** 351534 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The public as a whole must agree since their comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan as proposed back then.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrew M **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1092 **Comment Id:** 351555 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer reviewed, site specific or monitoring as required by law to initiate such a drastic change to the use of our public lands. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not properly address the concerns voiced in 2011 & those comments ran 3 to 1 against the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Mari Walsh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1120 **Comment Id:** 351671 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns experessed in comments filled in 2011 and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Tiffany A Turley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1168 **Comment Id:** 351820 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Roberta Sarnoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 549 **Comment Id:** 351908 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am outraged about the "new" dog management plan, and the way the GGNRA ignored the will of the public, I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.
Organization:

Commenter: Joyce Schroeder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 551 **Comment Id:** 351987 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I commented on the original proposals and I was very disappointed that the GGNRA didn't go further in their revision, following the volume of feedback they received.
Organization:
Commenter: Matthew Darby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 552 **Comment Id:** 351988 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.
Organization:
Commenter: Mary T Brett **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1241 **Comment Id:** 352051 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In 2011, the GGNRA tried to implement a similar plan. It was opposed in the public comments b a margin of 3:1. these are public lands and the GGNRA need to listen to the entire public
Organization:
Commenter: Sheri P Benjamin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1255 **Comment Id:** 352179 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the critisms and concerns expressed in 2011 comments; we support NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE, the SEIS contains no perr-reviewed, site specific studies or monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to inititiate such a dramatic change to the public's use to public land. We want the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy to be retained
Organization:
Commenter: Diane Rice **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1300 **Comment Id:** 352262 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the

earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Osteen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1303 **Comment Id:** 352275 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I feel totally betrayed by the GGNRA's complete dismissal of the 70% o comments supporting keeping ALL of the current off leash areas open to dogs. You asked for feedback, we gave it to you, and you IGNORED US! Are you going to do that again this time?

Organization:

Commenter: Marya Taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1307 **Comment Id:** 352279 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1308 **Comment Id:** 352281 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011. Comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan. Furthermore alternative A will force people into to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

Organization:

Commenter: Mike S Van Allen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1311 **Comment Id:** 352288 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:
Commenter: Chandra Asken **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1319 **Comment Id:** 352301 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative
Organization:
Commenter: Tina C N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1321 **Comment Id:** 352304 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. As stated earlier, there are no compelling reasons or justification for these changes aside from "ease of enforcement," thereby depriving the most frequent users of these trails of our daily benefit from using these outdoor places which were originally intended for our benefit.
Organization:
Commenter: Christine Stuart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1331 **Comment Id:** 352329 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Importantly, we feel the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.
Organization:
Commenter: Laura Rende **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1372 **Comment Id:** 352410 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: GGNRA for 3 years keep issuing documents that don`t change and ignore the wishes of SF Residents.
Organization:
Commenter: william e hartnett **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1374 **Comment Id:** 352413 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am alarmed that the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. I have written numerous letters over the years and feel my voice and comments, and those of others, have not been heard!!

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1405 **Comment Id:** 352500 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 which ran 3:1 against the plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Jon Weis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1414 **Comment Id:** 352511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Maya A De La Rosa-Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 556 **Comment Id:** 352634 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA's plan to limit by over 90% te lands on which dogs can be walked is unreasonable and massively unpopular, and the GGNRA has pushed forward this plan despite overwhelming public comments against it, totally ignoring the public's wishes. The Supplemental Plan does not address many of the criticisms made in public comments on the Draft, despite being required to do so. They have ignored both the people and the Board of Supervisors.

Organization:

Commenter: Mark Darley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1502 **Comment Id:** 352717 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: In 2011, the GGNRA tried to implement a similar plan. It was opposed in the public comments by a margin of 3 to 1. These are public lands and the GGNRA need to listen to the public.

Organization: Miss

Commenter: Lynne Robertson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 622 **Comment Id:** 352756 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Â· The GGNRA's first "dog management" was roundly criticized 3 to 1 in public comments against it and opposed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Yet almost three years later, the GGNRA has now released a new plan that is identical to the original with insignificant, meaningless changes.

Organization:

Commenter: Vigyan Ahirwar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 667 **Comment Id:** 352869 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: No more DEIS, SEIS, Rulemaking, or comment periods when we all know you totally ignore the thousands who have responded to you and continue to pursue your own agenda of keeping people and animals out of the GGNRA.

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 668 **Comment Id:** 352879 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. GGNRA ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

Organization:

Commenter: Tim Rebbert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1499 **Comment Id:** 352923 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

Organization:
Commenter: Caitlin Burkhart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1504 **Comment Id:** 352934 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Furthermore, I understand your 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Matthew S Oresman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1510 **Comment Id:** 352958 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am very disappointed that the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia Severynse **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1520 **Comment Id:** 352982 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The users of the parks are its potential allies - the people who vote to support, who fund-raise, who come to the defense of the National Park system when it's threatened. Making policies that turn them off is bad not just for those with dogs, but for all of us who care about the environment and want others to care about it too. Many people feel their comments earlier were not considered in preparing this SEIS.
Organization:
Commenter: Rupa Bose **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1523 **Comment Id:** 352996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.
Organization:
Commenter: Len Carella **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1639 **Comment Id:** 353237 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In 2011, the GGNRA tried to implement a similar plan. It was opposed in the public comments by a margin of 3 to 1. These are public lands and the GGNRA need to listen to the public.

Organization:

Commenter: Nina P Le Baron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2763 **Comment Id:** 353278 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Furthermore, let's not forget the changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1654 **Comment Id:** 353475 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA is NOT PAYING ATTENTION TO THE CITIZENS with their promotion of this draconian, anti-dog bill. And it is insulting us with a "revised" plan, 2 years after the original plan, which is almost identical to the first plan, not taking the public response to the first plan into consideration in any meaningful way.

Organization:

Commenter: Dina Wilson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1735 **Comment Id:** 353537 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Stacey Dirzuweit **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 904 **Comment Id:** 353618 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I had hoped that this new plan would be an improvement over the original GGNRA dog management plan, because of the overwhelming opposition to the last one. This new plan, however, ignores what the vast majority of people say they want. The way it is now the Park Service is pretending to listen and to have public comment but you must know you are

not fooling anyone.
Organization:
Commenter: John Preston **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 909 **Comment Id:** 353629 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Because the changes made in the 2013 SEIS don't adequately address the concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 and that the comments in 2011 rand 3 to 1 AGAINST the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Lynn Y Graham **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1689 **Comment Id:** 353634 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And lastly - wasn't this issue already considered by NPS in 2011? I've been reading that the public comments received by NPS numbered 3-to-1 ***AGAINST*** further restrictions on dogs in the Marin County portions of the GGNRA. Is that true, too? If so, what is NPS management thinking? I know - the objective is to solve problems.
Organization:
Commenter: David E Gurley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 913 **Comment Id:** 353638 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS don't adequately address the concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 and that the comments in 2011 rand 3 to 1 AGAINST the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Nicole Jordan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1698 **Comment Id:** 353653 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This new plan does not incorporate feedback and has only minor changes from the publicly opposed 2011 plan
Organization:
Commenter: Renee Ballinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1711 **Comment Id:** 353674 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

Organization:
Commenter: elizabeth m wiens **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1755 **Comment Id:** 353737 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And what happened to all of the comments that were made back in 2011 as they seem to have disappeared or not even been considered. I went to each and every meeting and wrote letters, as did many of my friends and I can tell you the overwhelming response was from people who supported dogs off leash in certain GGNRA areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Sharon Salisbury **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 946 **Comment Id:** 353807 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am writing regarding the changes that were made in the 2013 SEIS, and that fact that they absolutely do NOT address the criticisms and concerns expressed in the comments that were filed in 2011. Please let it be noted that the 2011 comments were overwhelmingly (3:1) against this plan.
Organization: citizen
Commenter: Lisa Williams **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1796 **Comment Id:** 353938 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.
Organization:
Commenter: Sheryl R Owyang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1845 **Comment Id:** 354342 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes made in 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns in filed in 2011 and comments in 2011 ran against the plan. I support the no action alternative entirely for each area. Please, retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy as it is is one of the things that makes living in Marin so very special.
Organization: J Rudman & Associates
Commenter: Jillian Rudman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1932 **Comment Id:** 354573 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I strongly believe that the 2013 SEIS does not adequatelyaddress the criticism and concerns in the comments filed in 2011 which was 3:1 against the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: gary brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2037 **Comment Id:** 354730 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. Why solicit comments from the community if you simply plan to dismiss them?
Organization:
Commenter: Courtney C. **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2902 **Comment Id:** 355184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred A.lter.native. This analysis was requested by public com ment.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: james white **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2910 **Comment Id:** 355202 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted com ments in response to the first plan.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Kristin Kelly **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2929 **Comment Id:** 355228 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted com ments in response to the first plan.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Peter Olfe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2951 **Comment Id:** 355260 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS did not adequately consider com ments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these com ments (e.g., negative impacts on com munity and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred a.lter.native. The SEIS lists many, many com ments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS com ment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Nicole Macias **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2973 **Comment Id:** 355291 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no real justification in the SEIS for major changes, and there was insufficient response and support provided in response to com ments and questions from the com ment period from dog walkers.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: kerry lan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2977 **Comment Id:** 355299 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted com ments in response to the first plan.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Tracy Barsotti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2984 **Comment Id:** 355314 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS did not adequately consider com ments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them, and SEIS never gave results of public com ment on the DEIS. This shows the inherent unfairness of the SEIS

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Ketty Mobed **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2987 **Comment Id:** 355323 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is clear the second draft did not take into account any of the com ments from the first draft, from dog owners and non-owners alike.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Maura Lewis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3015 **Comment Id:** 355357 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS did not adequately consider com ments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jason Shulman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3016 **Comment Id:** 355362 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS did not adequately consider com ments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these com ments (e.g., negative impacts on com munity and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred a.lter.native. The SEIS lists many, many com ments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS com ment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Com ments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while com ments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Maria LoConte **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2048 **Comment Id:** 355496 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

Organization:

Commenter: LaDonna Willems **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2115 **Comment Id:** 355748 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Paul Buxbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2164 **Comment Id:** 355866 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.
Organization:
Commenter: Dominika Knossalla **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4192 **Comment Id:** 355966 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Stop wasting massive amounts of taxpayer money on these exhausting exercises in frustration - ANPR, NR, DEIS, SEIS - when they haven't listen to the thousands of com ments submitted, and the SEIS does not address concerns raised in the DEIS.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2167 **Comment Id:** 356088 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.
Organization:
Commenter: Dominika Knossalla **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2196 **Comment Id:** 356749 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.
Organization:
Commenter: Kevin D Clark **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2242 **Comment Id:** 356867 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization: Ruby Rieke Design

Commenter: Ruby Rieke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2671 **Comment Id:** 357027 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Second, procedurally, this attempt by the GGNRA to change the leash status is arbitrary, undemocratic, and very poorly researched. Persons from all stakeholder groups should be represented honestly in an open and participatory process. The GGNRA has clearly failed at being able to do that, as it is my understanding that the new plan did not respond in any significant way to thousands of people's substantive concerns and objections about the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Steven Armstrong **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357063 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored. A significant number of comments submitted in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's current dog plan. After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan has not been modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.
Organization:
Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2710 **Comment Id:** 357122 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In 2011 after the DEIS DMP was released and the NPS/GGNRA received over 4700 comments against there DEIS DMP, the GGNRA made a few very minor changes and put the nearly identical plan out as the SEIS DMP on Sept. 6, 2013 with out any kind of Site Specific Scientific Peer Review Studies that are required by Law. This is something the NPS/GGNRA has skipped in their zeal to disregard the public input.
Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2267 **Comment Id:** 357281 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Genovieve Gomez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2765 **Comment Id:** 357391 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Regarding the new proposal, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Jacob K Lesnik **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2770 **Comment Id:** 357418 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2771 **Comment Id:** 357427 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In light of the thousands of people who submitted comments and concerns in response to the first plan, it is also troubling that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect these objections.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357471 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The NPS has consistently ignored the very concerns and comments it solicited and inaccurately represents the conditions in these locations. The changes that were suggested have not been implemented and appear to have been dismissed without consideration
Organization: Dog City Tours
Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2792 **Comment Id:** 357484 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Unfortunately, I understand that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Cunningham **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2802 **Comment Id:** 357512 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Also, the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking, and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Joyce Q **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357569 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357574 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA document on the GGNRA website). They say they received over 4,700 comments, but never say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS says: NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas. (p. 100). But theres no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2296 **Comment Id:** 357666 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many

substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Liebrand **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2857 **Comment Id:** 357672 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Carrie Asby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2866 **Comment Id:** 357689 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not take into consideration all of the thousands of comments dog owners have submitted in various formats through the years, including myself.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrew J Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2316 **Comment Id:** 357739 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Public comment to the 2011 DEIS was largely opposed to restrictions on dog walking but SEIS fails to acknowledge these comments and the public's will.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3032 **Comment Id:** 357743 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Despite the fact that the GGNRA's original plan received an overwhelmingly negative response from citizens, with thousands sending comments against, the GGNRA made no significant changes and unilaterally decided to implement an extremely unpopular, destructive plan despite this overwhelming opposition.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen D Davies **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3036 **Comment Id:** 357751 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and those comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Corinne L Valentine **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2323 **Comment Id:** 357759 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: You seem to be just going through the motions of requesting comments, as opposed to genuinely HEARING the majority of the local residents who need to have access to these trails with their pets. Further, all comments expressed in 2011 were THREE to ONE AGAINST the GGNR plan. Criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, HAVE NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED BY NPS.

Organization:

Commenter: Alison Sumner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3232 **Comment Id:** 358004 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have submitted my opposition comments so many times, via email, website and in person - - but never feel heard. I have attended countless forums with the GGNRA and Nat'l Park Service. But the new plan was not modified in any real way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments the first time around.

Organization:

Commenter: chelsea hardaway **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2356 **Comment Id:** 358379 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I attended the GGNRA meeting about this issue in Pacifica about a year ago. It was 100% cear that the issue had already been decided, and the forum for public input was just an empty gesture. I would like to know, where are the compromises that have been made since that time? What was (and is) the impact of the public outcry?

Organization: Aspect Foundation

Commenter: Vivian Fearen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2357 **Comment Id:** 358381 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The outpouring of objects to previous drafts doesn't seem to have been addressed by the most recent draft. Elected officials have voiced their concerns and I have not seen a response.

Organization:

Commenter: Barry Hayes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2372 **Comment Id:** 358425 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Joyce M Wang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2386 **Comment Id:** 358877 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA.. that the change in 2013 seis.. did not adequtely address the citisns...
Organization:
Commenter: J stivalet **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2389 **Comment Id:** 358880 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA plan to limit severely dog walking and off leash activity in 2011 was commented upon with numerous objections to this radical change, so much so that the GGNRA came out with an alternative plan in September 2013. Unfortunately, the objections raised in the 2011 comments went largely unheeded and the alternative plan is just as objectionable.
Organization:
Commenter: Robert I Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2444 **Comment Id:** 358943 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The concerns/objections that many people expressed over the initial plan seem to have been disregarded, as no substantive changes were incorporated into the "revised" plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Theresa Ruppe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2445 **Comment Id:** 358945 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I renew my strenuous objection to this "dog management" plan. The NPS has been deceiptive throughout and continues to be so in this "updated" report that fails take into account account thousands of comments adverse to the plan. The
Organization:

Commenter: Katherine R Garn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2451 **Comment Id:** 358952 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: After 2-1/2 years in review, the 2013 SEIS was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the DEIS released in 2011, opposing the proposals in that plan by a margin of 3:1. The SEIS does not provide the results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the "Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA" document on the GGNRA website). You say you received over 4,700 comments, but do not specify how many respondents opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS reads: "NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas (p. 100)." But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3: 1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS. Rather, a community forum or roundtable should be set up to evaluate management going forward, including dog walkers and other GGNRA users.
Organization:
Commenter: Edgar P Bowron **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2453 **Comment Id:** 358957 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Unfortunately, I understand that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization: WaveWorks Coaching
Commenter: Anne Moellering **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2464 **Comment Id:** 358968 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Unfortunately, I understand that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth Rumsey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2510 **Comment Id:** 359011 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am especially concerned about the fact that public comment overwhelmingly runs against the new dog management plan and that this is not being taken into consideration. Our parks belong to us.

Organization:
Commenter: Larisa E Beckwith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2533 **Comment Id:** 359036 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization: Doggie Do Right Dog Training
Commenter: Sue Minsuk **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2538 **Comment Id:** 359058 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I'm familiar with the previous iteration of the plan. The new plan was changed in any legitimate fashion to reflect the inordinate number of concerns and objections in response to the prior plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Seth Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2543 **Comment Id:** 359066 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Additionally, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people (including myself) in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Janet A Magnuson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2554 **Comment Id:** 359074 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Jane CotÃ©-Cook **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2565 **Comment Id:** 359095 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in

response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Loida **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2587 **Comment Id:** 359125 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan simply does not reflect democratic change, as it was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in opposition of the original plan by a margin of 3:1. What the citizens of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describes how these spaces will be managed as RECREATION AREAS, which is what the lands are mandated to be (Golden Gate National RECREATION AREA), as opposed to a National Park, which clearly is inappropriate for lands within a crowded urban setting.

Organization:

Commenter: Miranda H Ruenroeng **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3437 **Comment Id:** 359229 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was definitely not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan House **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3646 **Comment Id:** 359295 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: the 2013 SEIS was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the DEIS released in 2011, opposing the proposals in that plan by a margin of 3:1. An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3: 1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Claire McAuliffe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4011 **Comment Id:** 359588 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan either eliminates or dramatically reduces existing dog walking access. It does not take into consideration the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Robyn A Leonard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3790 **Comment Id:** 359821 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My comment is, it is pointless to make a comment since you clearly are ignoring all past comments of 2011, which I diligently and painstakingly researched. In a letter to me, Nancy Pelosi asked me to trust the process. Unfortunately, after reading your non-response to the comments previously made, I cannot.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4027 **Comment Id:** 359965 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, which opposed the plan by an overwhelming margin. Was the NPS listening to those comments? It doesn't seem so.
Organization:
Commenter: Alan B Mullendore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3850 **Comment Id:** 359976 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Third, the proposal impermissibly fails to take into account the public comments from the earlier version of the plan. I had hoped the new proposed plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan. It is my understanding thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Shari M **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3869 **Comment Id:** 359997 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: David Levin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4035 **Comment Id:** 360264 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: it did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them.

Organization:
Commenter: Kristen Aramthanapon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3976 **Comment Id:** 360335 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Brendan Hickey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4051 **Comment Id:** 360341 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please listen to the comments and that the changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: BENJAMIN BOWER **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4510 **Comment Id:** 360456 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: D. Kathryn Tierney **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4565 **Comment Id:** 360635 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in the comments filed in 2011.
Organization:
Commenter: erica f Harrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4567 **Comment Id:** 360639 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in the comments filed in 2011.
Organization:
Commenter: Patrick L Harrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4562 **Comment Id:** 360653 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: After previous rounds of comments on previous plans, no changes have been made that amount to anything. Certainly none that address the overwhelmingly negative response to you plans to lock us out of our coastlands.
Organization:
Commenter: steve r hooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4584 **Comment Id:** 360986 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally, in reviewing the SEIS it appears that a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS. Such clear disregard for a large number of comments strongly suggests that this process is only for show and has no substance.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Carboy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4584 **Comment Id:** 360989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Carboy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361115 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I wrote a comment back in 2011 for the DEIS and feel my suggestions for better education, improved signage and enforcement of existing rules were completely dismissed. The fact that comments ran 3-1 against your Preferred Alternative F and you went ahead and rolled out basically the same plan with just a few cosmetic changes is infuriating and telling that you are determined to kick dogs off no matter what.
Organization:
Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4642 **Comment Id:** 361161 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When Rep Burton first proposed ceding Our beaches to GGNRA it was always identified that the use and enjoyment of those beachs would not be reduced or restricted. Not

only are the proposasls exactly contradictory of that stated intent but they clearly failed to take into account all of the comments, are no different from what was proposed before the comment period, were not the product of a truly transparent or fully participatory comment period, apply an identified bias, and fail to understand the use of the lands for an urban community that cares passionately about it's parks

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Gropper-Nelson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4644 **Comment Id:** 361166 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. Do not turn a blind eye to the DEIS comments.

Organization:

Commenter: John Delaplane **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4115 **Comment Id:** 361454 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I understand that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. I think these comments are so important to consider, as they reflect not just my opposition but the many others in our communities.

Organization:

Commenter: Monika Fedalen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4781 **Comment Id:** 361515 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not changed in any significant way to reflect the objections opponents to the plan had during the 1st phase.

Organization:

Commenter: Katherine Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4785 **Comment Id:** 361522 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing today to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's most recent Dog Management Plan. The preferred alternative does not significantly reflect the substantive concerns and objections that I and thousands of other people submitted in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Laurie Berk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4787 **Comment Id:** 361531 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This new plan ignores many valid comments from thousands of GGNRA users submitted in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4795 **Comment Id:** 361551 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: A majority of the public comments to the original EIS were opposed to restricting both on leash and off leash dog walking. Yet the SEIS does almost nothing to acknowledge these concerns.
Organization:
Commenter: Kenji Okamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4948 **Comment Id:** 361813 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am also letting you know I am concerned that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of submitted in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Troy W **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4952 **Comment Id:** 361820 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The present plan was not modified in any meaningfully significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people- -including me- -who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Steven Lanum **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361977 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My comments to the 2011 DEIS were not adequately addressed and most criticisms and concerns expressed in all comments filed in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5020 **Comment Id:** 362015 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: the plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan
Organization:
Commenter: Genevieve Coyle **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5039 **Comment Id:** 362031 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: kate N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5049 **Comment Id:** 362114 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes in the 2013 seis are not founded by any data nor addressing the criticism expressed in 2011.
Organization:
Commenter: Ben Hobson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5103 **Comment Id:** 362183 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In reading the most recent plan, it has not been modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections from the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the initial plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Amy Puffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5138 **Comment Id:** 362269 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them.
Organization:
Commenter: Kate Gruen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4239 **Comment Id:** 362308 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4260 **Comment Id:** 362325 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: - In the revised plan, it is fairly obvious that you did not take proper account of public opinion. Although you did not share specific results of the original plan with the public, independent reviews show that the comments to the original plan were at least 3 to 1 in favor of dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne A Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4263 **Comment Id:** 362334 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Kim Dang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4278 **Comment Id:** 362351 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Julie Lesnewich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4299 **Comment Id:** 362364 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many concerns and objections of the people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Melody Jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5206 **Comment Id:** 362603 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We have heard that new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Noelle G Gibbs **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5210 **Comment Id:** 362610 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara Lazarow **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362631 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS does not adequately address the concerns of the public comments filed in 2011 that were overwhelmingly opposed to the alternatives of the DEIS.
Organization:
Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5251 **Comment Id:** 362812 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I wrote to you when changes to the dog management within the GGNRA were considered previously. It looks as if my comments and those of many others were completely disregarded by you. Open space is needed by everyone.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Nightingale **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5278 **Comment Id:** 362867 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362886 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I write now, after having written a letter to the Draft EIS in 2011 which was ignored
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362893 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Here are a few questions regarding my serious objections to this proposal: - Why does the GGNRA rely on outdated studies and information for the latest environmental impact statement? - - Why hasn't the GGNRA updated its enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released? - How is it that the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented? How is it the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis? - How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply ignore the voices of so many individuals, groups and elected representatives? - How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply not consider or address a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS?
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5291 **Comment Id:** 362896 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I understand that our city has evolved since the original guidelines, but the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many concerns and objections of the thousands of citizens who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Natala Menezes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5294 **Comment Id:** 362908 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Anna Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5361 **Comment Id:** 363013 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I understand that in comments submitted in 2011 for the DEIS they were overwhelmingly in favor of off leash dog walking and the 1979 Pet Policy by 3:1.
Organization:
Commenter: David B Caldwell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5390 **Comment Id:** 363040 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. Your own leadership has shown a complete lack of interest in working with the community.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5448 **Comment Id:** 363292 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Heather Dooley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5471 **Comment Id:** 363331 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new dog management plan does not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.
Organization:
Commenter: Kerry N Fischer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5489 **Comment Id:** 363360 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is shocking how many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan have been ignored.
Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5530 **Comment Id:** 363906 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This is the second time I have commented on this plan, only to have my comments ignored as the revised plan came back pretty much like the first one - eliminating off leash dog areas from Fort Funsten, Crissy Field, Marin etc. and even banning dogs altogether in places!
Organization:
Commenter: Megan G Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5546 **Comment Id:** 363932 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5546 **Comment Id:** 363933 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5604 **Comment Id:** 363989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: â€¨â€¨I am surprised the GGNRA is not responding to the comments of so many individuals, groups and elected representatives.â€¨Nor do I understand how the GGNRA chose not to address a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS. â€¨â€¨This has lead me to question if process has been for appearances only and the GGNRA did not intend to incorporate public or even elected representative's views.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5604 **Comment Id:** 363993 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: How is it that the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented? â€¨How is it the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5617 **Comment Id:** 364012 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In fact, the changes don't really take into account the comments or requests make by city residents or even San Francisco's Board of Supervisors.

Organization:

Commenter: Seth N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5624 **Comment Id:** 364023 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It seems the latest restrictions on dog access did little to take into consideration the pro-dog comments since 2011.

Organization:

Commenter: Kelly Horner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5638 **Comment Id:** 364057 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Jamie Coughlan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5659 **Comment Id:** 364086 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: elizabeth cavagnaro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4375 **Comment Id:** 364131 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5711 **Comment Id:** 364178 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My understanding is that the SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5750 **Comment Id:** 364231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: M John **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5771 **Comment Id:** 364273 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am disappointed that the GGNRA is still considering taking these actions after the fierce criticism and concerns expressed in 2011.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5829 **Comment Id:** 364372 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The changes that GGNRA made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately respond to the concerns expressed by the public in 2011. Recall that public comments in 2011 were 3 to 1 against further restrictions of dog access to GGNRA. Like every branch of the federal government, the NPS has a statutory obligation to heed public views with regard to administration of the resource.

Organization:

Commenter: Ned Black **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5847 **Comment Id:** 364394 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura I Ducoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364478 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This plan does not take into account the numerous concerns of the San Francisco public who have submitted their feedback and will also prevent me from taking part in the various benefits that the GGNRA offers and is intended to provide

Organization:

Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5889 **Comment Id:** 364518 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a taxpayer, I am also appalled to think that in over two years, all the proposal writing team could manage to provide in this "updated copy", was several more pounds of pages pushing their last recommendation, often with irrelevant or imprecise detail, while failing to document or even to acknowledge appropriately the many opposing points of view voiced since the last go around.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5969 **Comment Id:** 364832 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The public as a whole must agree since their comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against

the plan as proposed back then
Organization:
Commenter: Gillian Manning **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6028 **Comment Id:** 364998 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan clearly has not been significantly modified in response the substantive concerns and objections of thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Rhodes Klement **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4432 **Comment Id:** 365222 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: andrew and nanci scoular **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4469 **Comment Id:** 365354 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Im writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRAs new draft dog management plan. The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Jordan Hinkes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4472 **Comment Id:** 365359 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is my understanding that the proposed dog management plan does not reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the plan released for public comment in 2011.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne M Crosthwaite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4478 **Comment Id:** 365371 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many

substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: anette cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365375 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The DEIS received thousands of comments with the majority opposed to the preferred plans, yet there is little change between the DEIS and the newer SEIS, and in many cases the changes are even worse than the original proposal

Organization:

Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4493 **Comment Id:** 365408 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in our comments submitted in 2011. As you are aware, the feedback in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan. It appears to me that our feedback did not make a difference, that GGNRAs mind was already made up.

Organization:

Commenter: Pavla Sim **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6101 **Comment Id:** 365413 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: On a related note, I had submitted comments to the draft plan in 2011 and I am disappointed that the current plan did not address my significant concerns.

Organization:

Commenter: Dave Emanuel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6112 **Comment Id:** 365428 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: chris L hackler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6116 **Comment Id:** 365463 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am disappointed that " SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the

DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word.

Organization:

Commenter: SUSAN OBAYASHI **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6315 **Comment Id:** 365496 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: that the changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Organization:

Commenter: David Lehr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6131 **Comment Id:** 365528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Raimondo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365535 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We appreciate the extensive research that went into the preparation of the Draft SEIS, especially the 24 peer reviewed studies that confirm the impact of dogs on wildlife and habitats. The findings of these studies are applicable to impacts of dogs everywhere and provide ample support for recommendations to limit dog use to protect wildlife in sensitive habitats.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6150 **Comment Id:** 365629 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not significantly modified to reflect concerns and objections of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:
Commenter: Philip D Battat **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6334 **Comment Id:** 365633 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan doesn't reflect comments submitted by thousands of people who responded with legitimate concerns and objections to the first plan. Residents are still waiting for the legally required peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports the proposed drastic restriction of areas where we may recreate with our pets.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Barrows **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6684 **Comment Id:** 365767 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.
Organization:
Commenter: Erin Tom Nowell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6684 **Comment Id:** 365768 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.
Organization:
Commenter: Erin Tom Nowell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6368 **Comment Id:** 365808 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: sherry gooltz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6376 **Comment Id:** 365815 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in

response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Scott W Kurth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6196 **Comment Id:** 365997 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Chloe Kirby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6240 **Comment Id:** 366164 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicole D H **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6246 **Comment Id:** 366192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS was not modified in any significant way from the DEIS to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. Why not?

Organization:

Commenter: Rhonda Vitanye **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6248 **Comment Id:** 366205 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am saddened by your complete and total disregard for the tens of thousands of comments you've received from the dog-walking community regarding the "dog management plan". This process has, from the very beginning, been a huge smokescreen. Despite the very active participation of our community, we have been shut out and/or ignored at almost every juncture.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa Vittori (GGNRA) **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366210 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I submitted several objections to the Draft Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) released in 2011 and I do not believe the recently released Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) adequately addresses them. For this reason, I remain opposed to the planned changes to the GGNRA dog policy. Specifically, I object to the decrease in areas allowing off-leash dog walking and the plan to automatically ban off-leash dog walking in newly acquired lands even if it has traditionally been allowed.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6257 **Comment Id:** 366217 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS fails to make any meaningful change to the EIS even though the majority of public comment was opposed to reducing areas where on leash and off leash dogs are permitted.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6424 **Comment Id:** 367009 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Despite the initial public comments GGNRA received during the first public comment period, I do not feel the new plan has been modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who took the time to submit their comments. You can bet for your average citizen of San Francisco, or user of the GGNRA, this public comment process is not an insignificant gesture of civic action. It has involved a significant commitment of time, energy and faith in the process.

Organization:

Commenter: Carolyn E Suh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6608 **Comment Id:** 367151 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: WHEREAS, in the Public Comment response to the Draft EIS, the National Park Service received over 4,700 responses, with the ratio in opposition to the Preferred Alternative F at 3:1, and the County of Mann Department of Parks and Open Space submitted a letter on May 27, 2011, expressing concerns that the proposed limitations to dog walking in GGNRA would move the displaced users to County open space and parklands and MMWDs watershed, each comprising approximately 20,000 acres, resulting in significant impacts to county parks by the displaced users

Organization: Marin County Board of Supervisors

Commenter: Kathrin Sears **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Around 4700 public comments were submitted for the DEIS in 2011. A forensic accountant took the time to do a count of these comments and found that the people who were in support to retain the status quo of the GGNRAs 1979 Pet Policy (dogs under voice control in certain areas of Marin and SF counties) plus including the new San Mateo county lands was a clear 3 to 1 majority. We are tired of the GGNRA spin of saying that the dog supporters had a little over fifty per cent support for this issue. That is simply incorrect.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6500 **Comment Id:** 367591 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. There do not appear to be any site-specific studies showing that off-leash dogs harm public recreation areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Todd Latham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6501 **Comment Id:** 367593 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Tushar Prabhakar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6507 **Comment Id:** 367604 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There has not been any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or science-based monitoring, as should be required by law, before effecting these large-scale changes to the public use of the lands. The public is against these changes, 3 to 1, as shown in the comments to the 2011 plan. I'll bet those numbers are even higher now in opposition to the current plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Scott A Stender **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6511 **Comment Id:** 367631 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Sergei Lubensky **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368099 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored. A significant number of comments submitted in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRAs current dog plan. This is very worrying.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6644 **Comment Id:** 368173 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathryn Nyrop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6644 **Comment Id:** 368174 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathryn Nyrop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368237 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive comments in response to the first plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6495 **Comment Id:** 368678 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS also seems to ignore all of the comments the dog -owning users, and SF/ Federal leaders surrounding impacts on the community at large and it's outdoor space needs. With well-documented data on the amount of dog owners, dogs, and users - it is bewildering that the NPS is attempting to greatly restrict access to these areas. The NPS seems to have ignored and failed to address my own questions, as well as countless others who commented in favor of less -restrictive dog policies during the 2011 DEIS public outreach. With over 4500 comments to the DEIS by our community â€“ why has the NPS not done justice to individuals who support expanded dog access? Where is the process to give consideration to those that support consistent off-lease access to GGNRA? The NPS and the DEIS/SEIS has systemically ignored the Bay Area dog community.

Organization:

Commenter: Scott Stawicki **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6564 **Comment Id:** 368691 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: After 2-1/2 years in review, the 2013 SEIS was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the DEIS released in 2011, opposing the proposals in that plan by a margin of 3:1.

Organization:

Commenter: Edgar P Bowron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6564 **Comment Id:** 368693 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not provide the results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the "Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA" document on the GGNRA website). You say you received over 4,700 comments, but do not specify how many respondents opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS reads: "NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas (p. 100)." But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3: 1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS. Rather, a community forum or roundtable should be set up to evaluate management going forward, including dog walkers and other GGNRA users.

Organization:

Commenter: Edgar P Bowron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1071 **Comment Id:** 368726 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Public input was not sought or considered enough in the creation of the plan.

SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who don't want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and was ignored.

Organization:

Commenter: Janet Slissman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1137 **Comment Id:** 368737 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth B Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1138 **Comment Id:** 368743 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Mario Yovkov **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1139 **Comment Id:** 368749 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Alan Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1236 **Comment Id:** 368757 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan. The SEIS appears to have dismissed nearly all the previous comments from dog walkers.

Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1236 **Comment Id:** 368759 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA document on the GGNRA website). They say they received over 4,700 comments, but never say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS says: NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas. (p. 100). But theres no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.(
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6686 **Comment Id:** 369063 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We would point out that a good case can be made that the Code of Scientific and Scholarly Conduct and Federal Policy on Research Misconduct have been violated repeatedly by GGNRA personnel since the 2005 reinstatement of the 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy. Evidence of the misconduct has been submitted by OBDOG by way of public comment when "studies" were revealed to support closures. It is unconscionable that GGNRA/ NPS/DOI personnel who reviewed comments prior to these closures never made any attempt to rectify the shortcomings, and apparently condoned them. Certainly, comments regarding the 2006 Daphne Hatch "study" out at Ocean Beach confirmed scientific and research misconduct based upon Federal policy guidelines. The GGNRA/ NPS/DOI ignored the scientific policy violations, and actually implemented the closure this discredited "study" was submitted to support! Clearly, there is no scientific accountability within the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI and, in fact, scientific misconduct is authorized and supported by management all the way up to the highest levels of the Department of the Interior.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6580 **Comment Id:** 369518 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: -A significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRAs Draft ETS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRAs Supplemental EIS -is this process only for show or are you taking things seriously?
Organization:
Commenter: Gina Symczak **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6580 **Comment Id:** 369519 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: -The SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.
Organization:
Commenter: Gina Symczak **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6557 **Comment Id:** 369553 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Moreover, this new plan ignores comments from dog walkers on an earlier version with no justification.
Organization:
Commenter: Isabelle S Beekman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6581 **Comment Id:** 369571 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: After the overwhelming response to the DEIS, three to one in favor of continuation of off-leash, the SEIS seems to ignore those responses and has created more restrictions. Your preferred alternative so greatly reduces or eliminates off-leash areas that your plan does not seem workable. By reducing offleash and other areas for dogs by 90%, alternative, I fear, will result in people and dogs venturing into areas that are currently not open for dog walking.
Organization:
Commenter: Sally Cancelmo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6584 **Comment Id:** 369580 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am alarmed that the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. I have written numerous letters over the years and feel my voice and comments, and those of others, have not been heard!!
Organization:
Commenter: Emily Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6595 **Comment Id:** 369587 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Comments provided on the DEIS have not beed adequately responded to. The changes made to the DEIS were less that substantive considering the serious inadequacies noted.

Organization:
Commenter: Antonia Sivyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369637 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Three years ago, I used those same words to describe the DEIS. I suggested the DEIS be thrown out and redone in an unbiased, science-based way. Unfortunately, nearly all the criticisms I leveled at the DEIS also apply to the SEIS. Faced with significant substantive criticisms of the DEIS, the GGNRA chose to make only minor changes in the SEIS. Clearly, they did not adequately respond to the substantive criticisms of the DEIS made in many public comments, including mine. The GGNRA has proven that it cannot produce an unbiased, science-based EIS. The SETS and the Dog Management Plan it supports must, once again, be thrown out.
Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group
Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369639 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: THE GGNRA DID NOT ADEQUATELY RESPOND TO COMMENTS ON THE DEIS Comments on the DEIS made by SFDOG and other dog owners and walkers raised many issues that the DEIS did not consider, e.g., human health benefits and community building aspects of dog walking, and negative impacts on nearby city parks. These comments are listed in the DEIS Comment Response Report as substantive. However, nowhere in the SEIS or in the DEIS Comment Response Report is there a clear explanation of how those substantive comments were considered, what role they played in the revised SEIS impact analysis, or even if they were considered at all or merely dismissed without reason. For example, the DEIS Comment Response Report identifies Concern ID #30445 (p. 335): If the proposed restrictions were implemented, it would result in the loss of a community of dog walkers. Many visitors felt this community was their main tie to the GGNRA, and for many, it is a main channel of social interaction. Visitors felt the loss of this community would have a negative impact on their quality of life. The Response to this Comment given on p. 336 is: Comments were considered during revision of impact analysis. Please see Chapter 4, Visitor Use and Experience for details. Yet when you read Chapter 4, Visitor Use and Experience, there is no detailed discussion about how these comments about community were included in the alternative evaluations or even if they were considered at all. There is what amounts to a simple list of comments made by visitors who like walking with dogs that includes community. However, there is no way to tell, when reading the discussions of impacts of the various alternatives at each site, whether any consideration was given to the effects of each alternative on the social community of dog walkers. Chapter 4, Visitor Use and Experience does not give the details that the DEIS Comment Response Report said it would.
Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group
Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369640 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Similarly, concerns in the DEIS Comment Response Report about the human health benefits of dog walking and negative impacts on human health of restrictions on dog walking (e.g., p. 154) refer to Chapter 4, Human Health and Safety in the SEIS for details as to how they were considered. Yet again, when you go to Chapter 4, Human Health and Safety, you find another list of comments that include the human health benefits of dog walking, while the analyses of the alternatives at each site focus entirely on dog bites and unruly dogs, with no mention of positive human health benefits from dog walking or of negative impacts on human health from restrictions on dog walking. As I said in my DEIS comment, NEPA law requires the GGNRA to consider impacts on humans, including human health and social community in an EIS: -Human environment shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment. (see the definition of effects (1508.8).) 40 CFR 1508.14 " Effects and impacts as used in these regulations are synonymous. Effects include ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. 40 CFR 1508.8 (emphasis added) It is not enough to merely provide a list of sample DEIS comments made in the SEIS. There is no way to tell from the DEIS Comment Response Report or the SETS whether the GGNRA actually considered impacts on human health or social community. The GGNRAs failure to adequately address my DEIS comments indicates the SETS is as flawed as the DEIS, and it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369641 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE GGNRA IGNORED DEIS COMMENTS THAT SHOWED MISLEADING CITATIONS THAT BIASED THE ANALYSIS AGAINST DOGS In a DEIS public comment dated May 17, 2011, Keith McAllister listed over 15 cases of incorrect or misleading citations of articles that the DEIS claimed showed negative impacts from dogs on vegetation and wildlife. He showed, by quoting from the source articles, how the way the DEIS referred to these articles was misleading or inaccurate, or that the articles cited did not include evidence to back claims made in statements. Sadly, these same misleading citations appear in the SEIS, word for word the same as in the DEIS. In particular, citations of Sime 1999 are repeated over and over in the SEIS (in particular from pp. 374 - 378), despite McAllisters proof in his DETS comment that her quoted statements are not supported by evidence in the reference cited or refer to impacts on sensitive alpine habitat that are not found in the GGNRA. Similarly, McAllister showed in his DEIS comment that citations of Miller et al. 2001 that say the articles shows that dogs disturb wildlife more than people alone and that dogs increase a persons radius of disturbance are, in fact, incorrect. Miller et al 2001 actually showed the opposite - that dogs disturbed birds less than people with dogs or people alone. Yet the incorrect DEIS claim recurs in the SEIS on p. 376. The fact the SETS repeated the same, misleading citations that McAllister debunked in his DEIS comment without change is further evidence the GGNRA did not adequately respond to the DEIS comments. All of the misleading citations push the analysis in

one direction only - dog walking is bad. Not a single misleading citation would lead you to say dog walking is beneficial. This is not just sloppy work; it is outright bias in the analysis. That kind of bias has no place in an EIS. Therefore the SETS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/02/2014)

SA1100 Site Accessibility Issues (Substantive)

1. **Commenters expressed that the dog management plan does not provide suitable alternatives that allow accessibility for all users and visitors. Commenters expressed more specific concerns with the accessibility of the preferred alternative at several sites, including Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Rodeo Beach, and Mori Point.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 337962 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My comment is on dog use plans for Mori Point. Your current preferred draft plan (E/F) is unrealistic and potentially impedes use and comfort of visitors with limited mobility who do not have dogs. Here is why: Mori Point has only one path that is accessible to human pedestrians with limited mobility and has any area defined for human comfort (i.e. benches to sit on). That is Old Mori trail and the pedestrian boardwalk by the ponds and protected habitat. The "limited mobility" group would include the elderly, parents of infants and toddlers transported in strollers, and anyone with a physical disability affecting their ability to walk up hills. It might also include many cyclists, as the hiking trails at Mori point are not suitable for cycling. Some park users with limited mobility have dogs, but many do not. The only way for a dog walker to bypass Old Mori trail and/or the pedestrian boardwalk (where human users might rest to enjoy the natural scenery) is via Lishumasha trail and Upper Mori trail. The only plan that depicts that trail as being open to leashed dogs is Map 17-A (current usage) - - therefore, of the plans you have presented,that is the only one that will protect the interests of all current users.

Organization:

Commenter: Abigail R Marshall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 502 **Comment Id:** 351819 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My comments are restricted to the Crissy Field Area because that is where I go with my dog. With the exception of the "no change" map/plan, no other alternatives adequately accommodate the elderly or people with disabilities to walk and exercise their dogs off-leash: 1. Exclusion from all hard services to walk dogs off-leash - - the path. 2. Lack of convenient parking to access permitted off-leash areas. 3 Distance to walk to gain access to off-leash area. 4. The inclusion of areas that are either grass or soft sand - - surfaces which are difficult/impossible for handicapped or elderly to walk on.

Organization:

Commenter: Margot S Parke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1247 **Comment Id:** 352058 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having Rodeo Beach as the only off-leash area in Marin is untenable. For one thing, it is very difficult to reach. It is completely against any ecological idea of reducing driving because it is impossible to get there without a major drive either through the headlands or through the tunnel- -both already crowded on nice weekends and always a long drive in the best of circumstances. I live in southern Marin and still find it too far to go on any regular basis. What about people living farther north?

Organization:

Commenter: Juliana Jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2008 **Comment Id:** 354678 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I like to walk at Fort Funston with my son and daughter-in-law and their two dogs, Pancho and Marisa. Because I have some problems walking, I can't get down the steep path to the beach. So we walk together around the trails in the upper area of Fort Funston. But if your preferred alternative goes into effect, the off-leash part of the upper area will be so small that we really won't be able to exercise the dogs there. And I won't be able to get down to the beach with my son and daughter-in-law. I oppose your preferred alternative because it would prevent me from being able to spend time walking with my family. I'm sure this will also affect other people who are elderly or disabled.

Organization:

Commenter: Rodolfo Garcia **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2564 **Comment Id:** 359090 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Upper and Lower Mori Point: 1) PLEASE keep on leash dog access on Upper Mori trail to Sweeny Ridge: I have a back issue which prevents me from running and briskly walking up the steep upper Mori trail has a level of difficulty that I need to maintain my health and is one of the only exercises of this intensity that I can do with my back condition. Hiking these trails is so important to me that I purchased my house in Pacifica to live next to Mori point trail. These hikes have maintained my back health and helped reduce my high blood pressure and stress level. This is a wide trail with very few hikers - and those that I do encounter usually also have a dog. In urban areas, an important reason to conserve of open space is to provide residents like me a place to hike/exercise. 2) PLEASE keep on leash dog access on the wide but steep trails near Mori point: While my usual hike with my dog (on leash) is upper Mori trail to Sweeny Ridge, at times when it has been very rainy this trail is too muddy and slippery to use safely, so I then like to hike to Mori Point. This access is very important to my health as I have a back issue which prevents running but briskly hiking up bootlegger stairs and the upper trails of Mori provide me much needed exercise (only speed walking on the flat coastal trail next Mori point does not supply the same level of intensity).

Organization:

Commenter: A C **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3930 **Comment Id:** 360075 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For example insisting to have dogs on leash on the steep slopes of Funston, including the southern sand stairs. This will be extremely dangerous for the feeble, the elderly and any one else who finds traversing such terrain difficult-even without being jerked around by a dog who traverses the stairway with four feet instead of two. Adding a LEASHED dog in such an environment is not only extremely dangerous, it lacks common sense, Falling down stairs as a result of being jerked from a dog on a leash is not only dangerous to the dog owner but to other people on the sand stairs. A stairway that often is overcrowded with families including small children.

Organization:

Commenter: Fred A Andrews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters noted that sand was difficult to walk in for some visitors, who needed paved paths to access areas. These commenters felt that plan would limit the ability of visitors to recreate/exercise with their dogs. Other commenters noted that walking with dogs on-leash would limit the ability of some visitors to recreate with their dogs, as some visitors are not able to walk with their dogs on-leash.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 39 **Comment Id:** 338005 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It is difficult enough for senior citizens to walk the sand, let alone with a leashed dog which thinks it's going to run and chase balls.

Organization:

Commenter: Patrick N Nance **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 428 **Comment Id:** 351355 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off-Leash Benefits For the Two-Legged Companions: - Access for the Elderly and Disabled- For some, walking a dog on leash is an impossibility. The availability of off-leash areas enables such people to have dogs and experience all of the benefits of dog ownership.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 873 **Comment Id:** 353482 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a disabled person with a companion dog, I really value the ability I have to take my dog to places like Chrissy Field and Fort Funston where he can run off leash. I have Spina Bifida and use leg braces and a cane, as a result it is very difficult for me to walk my dog on leash. The loss of access to such places would be a great blow to both of us, and severely limit our options for outdoor recreation in the city. I find it very hard to use the existing enclosed dog parks in the city, as the dogs there tend to be very territorial and aggressive. In the past I have been knocked over by these animals, and so I am forced to sit on a bench. My dog is protective

and will then sit beside me and thus not take advantage of being off-leash. This is not a problem that occurs at more open spaces such as Chrissy Field and Fort Funston, where I am able to walk more freely and he can accompany me.

Organization:

Commenter: Charles J Whelon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4403 **Comment Id:** 364140 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The NPS claims to be a champion of seniors and disabled. Your plans to make the asphalt trails, which BTW have not had the sand removed for a very long time, on leash only means that the many seniors who might be a bit unsteady, or use canes, a walker, a wheelchair - not to mention the families with strollers - will be unable to walk with their dogs at FF.

Organization:

Commenter: Lindsay Kefauver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368267 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed ROLO areas described in the SEIS are prejudicial to senior citizens and the disabled. It is very dangerous to attempt to navigate the paths to the beach with a dog on a leash in the event the owner falls/slips. The proposed ROLO areas will deny disabled people the ability to have their dogs off leash as much of the proposed ROLO areas will not be accessible as the dogs will not be within visual range of persons who must stay on the paved paths due to disability.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6580 **Comment Id:** 369516 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA"s "preferred alternative" is definitely not our preferred alternative. It would greatly limit where Lucy and I could walk freely, together. I have walked so much on the sand, that I have actually injured my hip. It would be terrible if I could no longer walk freely with Lucy on the paths at Crissy, and had to be limited to the sand. I can't take her all the way to Ft. Funston and, even if I could, it's too dangerous for her because shes had two surgeries on her legs and the cliffs are difficult for her to navigate. I dont know what we'd do.

Organization:

Commenter: Gina Symczak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Parking areas should have easy access to off-leash areas for those visitors who cannot walk farther distances. Commenters also expressed issues with parking accessibility or chosen areas for parking in the dog management plan, or ability to**

get to locations under the new plan.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 350 **Comment Id:** 350661 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The off leash areas have to be somewhat close to parking for people who can not walk too far, and both open field and beach frontage should be included.

Organization:

Commenter: Wells Whitney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 868 **Comment Id:** 353466 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a native San Franciscan, a responsible dog owner and a senior citizen. In order for me and my two dogs to get adequate exercise, we need reasonably easy access too off-leash areas where we can walk a sufficient distance in a pleasant outdoor environment. Currently there are far too few such areas in San Francisco. At present, I must drive several miles from my home to access a pleasant off- leash area to walk with my dogs. Your current proposal would unacceptably decrease the number and size of such areas. Walking with my dogs is an important part of my health regime; it is equally important for my dogs' health to be able to obtain adequate exercise. Walking on leash with a 70-year-old woman does not afford them adequate exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Dianne G Estrin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2635 **Comment Id:** 356941 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The only off-leash area in all of Marin County would be a remote stretch of Rodeo Beach, which is only accessible by car. Dog owners, who normally walk or drive a short distance to their trails, would be forced into cars to drive miles away in order to exercise their pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Betsy DeFries **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362643 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And, the Coastal Fire Road and Trail is the ONLY GGNRA trail from Muir Beach accessible to a person with a dog, and is therefor the ONLY option for people in Muir Beach to use without getting in a car and driving over the hill and out of area completely. Having to leave Muir Beach and get in to a car just to walk a dog is UNREASONABLE. Tam Valley doesn't need more cars, and neither does Mill Valley. Traffic is already a nightmare, and leaving Muir Beach via car on a busy weekend is just not practical or wise.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6135 **Comment Id:** 365585 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The narrowness of Tamarind Street. The undeveloped street of Tamarind is very narrow and lacks sidewalks. Currently, cars often have to take turns passing through the narrowest part, because in places there is not room enough for two cars to pass. The street is not equipped to support more traffic and more parking.

Organization: Tamarind Street Resident

Commenter: Linda L Rutherford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 127 **Comment Id:** 346279 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am legally disabled and have a service dog that only gets limited exercise due to my disability. In the interest of humanity and kindness to animals, I need places, like Fort Funston, where I can let my dog run a bit. If the GGNRA insists on rigidly adhering to the regulations of rural federal parks

Organization:

Commenter: David D Lewis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 155 **Comment Id:** 349884 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The elimination of major portions of National Park services for off leash dogs, particularly Crissy Field and Fort Funston, severely hampers my ability to keep fit as a senior citizen. Recreation is not about watching my dog run in a small enclosed area. I am 69 years old and walk vigorously at fort funston and crissy field along with my 22 lb schnauzer sally off leash. I can not put her on leash as it throws me off balance. Your new proposal virtually eliminates my ability to recreate and will make me go to local san francisco parks to get my workout. This is unfair to san francisco as we gave the land to you for fort funston and against my health interests as a senior citizen.

Organization:

Commenter: cheryl e traverse **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 178 **Comment Id:** 349991 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In particular, closing altogether the East Beach at Crissy Field, and especially the largest part of Baker Beach to dogs altogether, is completely unacceptable. By doing this, you will: Disallow families and the elderly, people who cannot carry all of their things or walk far in order to play with their dogs, to enjoy these beaches. However, closing Baker Beach to dogs is an extreme measure that is completely unnecessary. (Much of the time, it is practically deserted, EXCEPT for people with dogs!!) f you do that, there will be one tiny area for dog play on the entire north end of the park west of the Golden Gate Bridge! At the very least you should allow dogs ON leash on all areas of Baker Beach, with off leash in the currently proposed area. This is a huge beach, which by and large, does not get crowded at all because of the weather. Closing this beach to dogs would create a real hardship for people who cannot, for one reason or another (elderly, small children, disabled) exercise their dogs by running or walking long distances on trails.

Organization:

Commenter: Dianne T Younger Rosse **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 352 **Comment Id:** 350698 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs need exercise and on leash exercise is not sufficient for many dogs larger than a Chihuahua. I am over 60 years old and no longer jog with my dogs. I cannot hike over sand dunes at Fort Funston and want to walk on paved roads while my dogs are off leash. Your "preferred" plan for Fort Funston will make it no longer a place I will want to walk my dogs, so I will not go there anymore. My husband does not walk well and he can only walk on the paved roads and cannot manage a leash as he uses walking poles to maintain balance. He cannot use the off road areas either. So Good bye, Fort Funston. Chrissy Field will get the overflow in a reduced area and will soon show damage. You are creating an environment that will be damaging by upsetting a balance that works right now.

Organization:

Commenter: Judith A Palmer Moran **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 364 **Comment Id:** 351265 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We need East Beach to remain leash free! And re Crissy Field, East Beach - the only accessible beach for the elderly physically disabled w dogs needing off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Koren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 396 **Comment Id:** 351312 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a resident of the marina and a dog owner - these plans make the area less desirable. Having a dog and regularly using a dog walker - as numerous friends do as well - these proposed changes will make it basically impossible to 1) have easy access to an off leash area. I support a lot of the GGNRA initiatives - however this is NOT one of them!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1018 **Comment Id:** 351440 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: These proposed changes don't allow for the kind of access and availability dog owners need.

Organization:

Commenter: Jon Charles Falk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 541 **Comment Id:** 351892 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: At Fort Funston ocean beach, the areas are naturally inaccessible to the very young (strollers), elderly handicapped. Unless GGNRA plans to pave over/build paved paths into these areas, dog use in these areas does not impact the part of the population who may have an issue with the dogs there.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1200 **Comment Id:** 351964 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have to basically never do a nice loop in Tennessee Valley because of the restrictions and you need to be a freaking map specialist to figure out where else they are allowed and not allowed.
Organization:
Commenter: Dorian G Polite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1255 **Comment Id:** 352181 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: To only allow off-leash access at Rodeo will create dog chaos with too many in one space, traffic jams and lots of complaints and outrage from local neighbors.
Organization:
Commenter: Diane Rice **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1337 **Comment Id:** 352344 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Rodeo beach is distant and isolated from the population in Marin. It seems a very poor choice of locations, and people generally do not drive that far to walk the dog. They will continue to use the areas adjacent to where the live. The best rules are the ones designed to work well, with the target population.
Organization:
Commenter: brian Spring **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 632 **Comment Id:** 352777 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The document's proposal to ban dogs on east beach does not consider access concerns, including restroom access and wheelchair access. The proposal should be modified taking into consideration the needs of all visitors.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Block **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 671 **Comment Id:** 352893 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The proposal is FAR TOO restrictive with regards to off leash areas at Fort Funston. The proposal limits off leash dog walking to two relatively small, overused areas on the bluff which are the least attractive sites in all of Fort Funston and to the beach, which is excellent

but difficult to access for elderly dog and disabled dog owners due to the steep, sandy trails which must be negotiated to reach the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Kirk L Moon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 869 **Comment Id:** 353468 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I strongly oppose any ban on dogs at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Baker and Ocean beaches. These areas are wonderful resources that Bay Area residents, and their dogs, should continue to be allowed to enjoy. Fort Funston, in particular is one of the few paved off-leash areas in SF and allows access for people with disabilities or injuries to walk, crutch, or wheel with their dogs off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Aura Smithers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4646 **Comment Id:** 353841 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I am particularly concerned that elderly and disabled people will not have an area to exercise their dogs off-leash if the new plan is implemented.

Organization:

Commenter: Hillary Huth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3200 **Comment Id:** 357966 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Since dogs will no longer be allowed in the vast majority of Ocean Beach, specifically near where I live, I will be forced to drive my dog to another recreation areas instead of walking to the beach as I now do. Many other people who live along ocean beach and who have dogs will also be forced to drive instead of walking. This will increase traffic and congestion around other neighborhoods and parks and badly impacts older or lower income people who do not own vehicles.

Organization:

Commenter: Alan Berezin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2560 **Comment Id:** 359086 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am 65 and for me and many older folks getting down to the beach at ft. Funston is a hardship so I need more space up above to walk.

Organization:

Commenter: Diane C Kefauver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361120 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS also sites that the only off-leash area for all of Marins 60,000 dogs would be a small stretch of Rodeo Beach. That beach is only accessible via car. Right now, many people can walk to their favorite off-leash trail including Oakwood, Miwok, Homestead and others. These federal lands are intertwined with our neighborhoods. Forcing people into their cars to exercise themselves and their dogs is not only horrible for the environment but also hard on the pocketbook. I also think its quite fiendish since the GGNRA has been in the process of downsizing the parking lot at Rodeo Beach and will begin encouraging people to take shuttles therefore making it increasingly impossible for Rodeo to become a full fledge ROLA in the future

Organization:

Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4641 **Comment Id:** 361159 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The only off leash location in Marin will be Rodeo Beach. Unfortunately Rpdeo Beach is only accessible by auto therefore all the dogs and their owners who do hot have cars are unable to go to Rodeo Beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Wendy Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4682 **Comment Id:** 361320 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a disabled person. I feel it's discrimination to make these changes that you propose. I won't be able to walk in places like Fort Funston if I can't use the paths. Please allow us to continue use of these areas, I as a dog owner have the legal right to these areas, just like everyone else.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara A Boschetti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361561 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sweeney Ridge I prefer option 19A with the addition of all of the Baquiano trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica to its conclusion at the Portola Discovery site. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dog walking given the historical use of area (once an active military site, 4x4 vehicle trails, gas/water/electricity rights of ways, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation. "No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing. "Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo

County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. "Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361563 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I Prefer 17A I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (4x4 vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a rural park setting. "Area is in a densely populated area with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking. "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking. "Symbolic fencing and signs have been effective in keeping people as well as people with dogs out of sensitive areas

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361564 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I prefer 20E I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle club/ motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.) "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a park setting. "Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361565 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Rancho Corral Tierra I prefer 21A "I do not support the the preferred alternative of 21F due to "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on or off leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.) "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a park setting. "Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash or off dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by dog walking. "Has been unregulated for 30 years "More research needed due to only being a park for less than two years

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4816 **Comment Id:** 361584 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: After studying the Fort Funston ROLA proposals it seems clear that no dog behaviorists were included as DEIS advisors, because neither the on or off-leash areas have any shade!!! Also, as a senior, Id risk injury trying to get Penny to the beach (which as you know is often unusable because of high tides or bad weather) on-leash, and because the trails would be crowded Penny would be anxious, esp. on-leash, and more likely to be aggressive (evincing possible leash rage). The ROLA proposed next to the parking lot is completely inadequate for the number of dogs using Fort Fun and is an invitation to non-compliance which under the current proposal would eventually result in dogs being banned entirely.

Organization:

Commenter: Judith D Kucera **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4903 **Comment Id:** 361749 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As an older person with mobility problems due to a disability, I find that the East Beach of Crissy Field is the only place I can comfortably take my dog to the beach. Parking is close enough to the water and there is an access ramp that makes it possible to get to the water with ease. To take away that particular area from off leash possibility would, in my view, discriminate against the older and disabled people that take their dogs there for exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila A Koren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361980 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it

proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force our community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA. Since the new parking lot opened this year, a large portion of that traffic and user group is now descending upon Muir Beach. The plan further suggests that those who want an off-leash beach experience for their dog can go to Rodeo Beach. This change would force Muir Beach residents into cars to drive 45 minutes on the congested 2-lane highway, then the freeway and then another 2-lane rural road for an off-leash experience that currently exists literally steps in front of their homes. The 45 minute drive is assuming that there is no traffic congestion. On a crowded day when visitorship to Muir Woods tops 5,000 people, it takes residents nearly double the time to travel out of the community.

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5021 **Comment Id:** 362129 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force the community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA. Since the new parking lot opened this year, a large portion of that traffic and user group is now descending upon Muir Beach. The plan further suggests that those who want an off-leash beach experience for their dog can go to Rodeo Beach. This change would force Muir Beach residents into cars to drive 45 minutes on the congested 2-lane highway, then the freeway and then another 2-lane rural road for an off-leash experience that currently exists literally steps in front of their homes.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Rowe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4276 **Comment Id:** 362348 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The NPS claims to be a champion of "seniors and disabled" (yet hasn't had a sand removal from the asphalt trails at Fort Funston for a very long time). Those who have difficulty walking on uneven ground, wheelchair users, and moms with strollers have effectively been banned. As a senior (I will be 70 on my next birthday), walking with my dogs is my primary form of exercise, recreation, and socialization. We walk from the parking lot out to the "last bench" or down the sand ladder and north on the beach to the beach trail.. Standing in the iceplant where the NPS has designated an off-leash area? That is not recreation, exercise, or socialization for me! My husband will turn 75 this year. He is no longer comfortable walking on uneven ground, so apparently he is no longer welcome at Fort Funston with the dogs. So much for the NPS being supportive of seniors or the disabled!

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Farrow **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362863 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm very disturbed to see that leashes are still being proposed for the sand ladder at Fort Funston. I raised this serious safety concern at the DEIS stage and it has not been corrected in the SEIS. Footing is very difficult to keep walking down the unmaintained sand ladder, which is sometimes composed of stair logs in the air, with the sand underneath having eroded away. The stair then moves when one steps on it, and having a dog pulling on a leash will surely result in falls and injuries. I have found it hard to keep footing just walking without a leashed dog in this location.
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5627 **Comment Id:** 364028 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Most important regarding Fort Funston, it is imperative that any revision allow off-leash dog walking under voice control on the uplands paved pedestrian pathway. The vast majority of visitors stay on this path, and many are elderly or handicapped, preventing them from leaving the pavement.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4403 **Comment Id:** 364141 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As with other seniors, walking with my dogs is my primary form of exercise, recreation, and socialization. We walk from the parking lot out to the last bench or down the sand ladder and north on the beach to the beach trail. Standing on a sand dune or in a patch of ice plant where the NPS has designated an off-leash area is not recreation, exercise, or socialization for us. [And BTW no maintenance of the few benches has been done in 20 years - most have only one single board for sitting or have been buried]. Therefore, with your current plans, many of us will no longer be welcome at FF with dogs. So much for the NPS being supportive of seniors, the disabled and even families! Where is your balance?
Organization:
Commenter: Lindsay Kefauver **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5889 **Comment Id:** 364517 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I only wish the same money had been spent on efforts improving the paved areas in Fort Funston, for just one example. Who knows, Fort Funston could have become more widely ADA accessible, although I do see many physically challenged people enjoying the paths

along with their pets off-leash in spite of the poor state of repair the GGNRA maintains.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365753 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sweeny Ridge/Cattle Hill I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge trail system. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if a dog is leashed it will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing. Visitor use of Sweeeny Ridge is relativity low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal. Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365754 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A) I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National

Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365755 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E) I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the new Devils Slide Trail. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6358 **Comment Id:** 365796 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Fort Funston is heartily enjoyed by a great many Bay Area residents as the best place to enjoy the outdoors with one's dog, allowing the dog to be off-leash under voice control. The elderly and disabled are able to enjoy this beautiful spot for that purpose as well as others. It is safe and very friendly, and at least in the uplands areas, the vast majority of off-leash dog walking is on the paved path.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6365 **Comment Id:** 365805 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: have recurring foot and leg issues with occasional flair ups of knee arthritis and

so from time to time have limited mobility. A couple years back I had to wear a "boot" for 4 months. During these months, the only way for me to get my dogs exercise (and I had a new puppy at that time) was to drive to Crissy Field, which I live near, sit on the sea wall and throw the ball for the dogs. I could walk out and clean up after the dogs but that was as far as I could venture. I was not be able to walk the dogs on leash to adequately walk them for months. If the only off leash area is the middle beach, I will not be able to exercise my dogs. My puppy is not even 3 years old yet and needs lots of running. I can't see how only offering the Middle Beach can comply with ADA being so far from the restrooms. Whether or not you think it may, it will negatively impact me and my access to use.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6209 **Comment Id:** 366122 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a frequent visitor and future resident of Montara, I oppose the proposed 'Regulated Off Leash Area' (ROLA) in the area between Le Conte St. and Tamarind St., Montara in the Rancho Corral de Tierra area of the GGNRA. Reference Alternative 'C' and 'E' of the GGNRA draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)." Some reasons to oppose the 'dog park' in this area: - Preserve / conserve the open space - The operation of the adjacent school and student safety will be adversely impacted - The streets accessing the area are not suited to additional traffic - The existing quiet neighborhood will be degraded by noise and traffic A fenced off-leash area directly adjacent to a residential community will be unsightly - dog excrement will accumulate despite best efforts by owners to cleanup. This is not only unsightly, but a potential public health hazard where dog parasites can contaminate the soil. Urine and fecal matter accumulation will smell and will ruin grass and topsoil. Barking and yelping will contribute to noise pollution.

Organization:

Commenter: Ellis Tobin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6459 **Comment Id:** 368536 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Rodeo Beach - we feel that many visitors who may desire a no-dog experience at Rodeo Beach will be disappointed. This is especially true of park visitors taking advantage of bus transit from San Francisco that only brings people as far as the Marin Headlands and Rodeo Beach. We appreciate the proposed improved access and no-dog status of South Rodeo Beach. We support the construction of the proposed fence around the west end of the lagoon, and propose a double fence to create a connection between the North and South sections of the Lagoon Loop Trail, to protect hikers from unwanted dog interactions.

Organization: San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Commenter: Steven Krefting **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369456 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Sunset Trail is still closed to the public (including those with disabilities), and the Preferred Alternative would restrict more of the trails the disabled might possibly access at Fort Funston to recreate with their dogs. At Sweeney Ridge in Pacifica stands the Portola Monument, considered to be the most historic site in the GGNRA. When the GGNRA took control of this property, it closed the access road off to cars, thereby preventing the disabled or mobility impaired from accessing this site. The hike from the current parking spot is 2.5 miles to the Monument, with an elevation rise of some 1,000 feet. The GGNRA has made no legitimate effort to remedy this situation, despite complaints from the City Council in Pacifica, and groups representing senior citizens. This DEIS/SEIS further restricts access to this portion of the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369488 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: These conditions are present for months on end. The sand overflows from the beach on to and across the promenade path. Imagine a disabled person trying to make their way through mounds of sand on the walkway. And the planters on the left were stripped of their ice plant and native plants were planted, surrounded by red pea gravel. The plants died, the pea gravel became dislodged and flows on to the walkway to provide yet another hazard for the walker. The one photo where there appears to be a ridge running through the sand is actually the seawall. On the beach side the sand is up to the top of the seawall, and on the promenade side the sand has piled up so high the walkway has been obliterated. Yet in this SEIS the GGNRA complains about spending 1.5 hours a day picking up trash at Ocean Beach which is over 3 miles long. From these photos it does not appear 1.5 hours a day is enough, and it also appears that people are bringing their trash up off the beach and often placing it next to overflowing trash receptacles. You cannot put the responsibility for this mess on dogs. The GGNRAs poor performance in maintenance of Ocean Beach should preclude them from holding the property- - it certainly does not meet the requirements as stated above in the documents of transfer.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6669 **Comment Id:** 369542 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGNRA, must immediately provide ADA access at Fort Funston. How is it that a Federal Organization cannot comply with federal law. I am a lifelong resident, native, disabled, dog owner. I believe that I am legally entitlad to recreate with my dogs off leash at the SF Beaches as I always have for 50 yrs.

Organization:

Commenter: Bess Martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6581 **Comment Id:** 369573 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: By eliminating all dogs on East Beach you prevent many elderly, disabled or infirm dog owners as well as families with small children access to the beach. These groups may find it difficult or impossible to walk from the parking lot to the Middle Beach. It is imperative that all citizens have access in the park. A weekend restriction at one end of East Beach could accommodate these groups

Organization:

Commenter: Sally Cancelmo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/04/2014)

TE2010 Threatened and Endangered Species: Affected Environment (Substantive)

1. Commenters felt that dogs disturbed and harassed special status species. Many commenters recounted stories of dogs disturbing special-status species.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1868 **Comment Id:** 354398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog owners rarely have their dogs on leashes in the Protected Area and I have witnessed increasing numbers of dogs harassing the Snowy Plovers and other birds. In some instances, I have also witnessed dog owners encourage their dogs to chase birds in the Protection Area as a play thing for enjoyment. Dog owners usually become confrontational when made aware of the Protected Area's on-leash and no-harrasment policies, and they usually do not seem to be aware of the Park's policies in the Protected Area or do not seem to be concerned, especially given the lack of enforcement.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4540 **Comment Id:** 360496 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs pose a serious menace to threatened species such as Snowy Plovers just by their presence. In creating a fear-generated disturbance to nesting plovers, for example, a single irresponsible dog owner and canine can undue decades of work to recover the populatin of the plovers and to set aside areas for them to breed and thrive, at taxpayer expense running in the millions of dollars.

Organization:

Commenter: Cindy J Margulis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4118 **Comment Id:** 362042 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Unleashed, uncontrolled dog activity is known to lead to habitat destruction and harassment and destroying of native and endangered species. If ESA regulations were being meaningfully enforced in the GGNRA, these actions would not be tolerated, and dog use that resulted in taking/destroying/disturbing listed species would be treated in a far more serious manner. There are times when mutually exclusive goals have to be recognized, and uncontrolled dogs will result in taking/disturbing of ESA listed species, under the willful negligence of the dog's owner.

Organization:

Commenter: greg norby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5446 **Comment Id:** 363287 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As such, I have witnessed dogs chasing endangered species (snowy plovers) as well as migratory shorebirds (willets, gulls, terns, marbled godwits, sanderlings) foraging to build up strength for their journey. I've even seen dogs walking along the rock revetment at the south end of the beach barking at nesting bank swallows. They shouldn't be subjected to the threat of dogs, especially in a National Park.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6132 **Comment Id:** 365539 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I often walk on Chrissy field beach from the Chrissy field parking lot to Fort Point. Most days when I walk there, there are at least one if not more dog owners walking their dog or dogs inside the protected area for the Snowy Plovers. They do not read the sign asking them to stay close to the water line. They trample the plants, and the area where the snowy plovers like to rest and hide, with their dogs. They usually don't listen when I ask them to observe the guidelines on the signs, by putting their dogs on leash and avoiding the areas away from the water line. This is very upsetting to me knowing how vulnerable the snowy plovers are.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters felt that special status species and habitat was not found in areas where dogs were allowed, and that problems under the current policies have been unusual, as dogs are kept under voice control along trails. Commenters also noted other factors that may be currently influencing these species.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 42 **Comment Id:** 338008 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am responding to the policy to close the Oakwood Valley Trail to dogs under voice control and to require them to be on-leash. I am a steward of Oakwood Valley and I have walked my dog on the trail for the 37 years I have lived in Tam Valley. Problems have been extremely rare with dogs under voice control. There is no habitat damage when owners keep there dogs on the trails. Fragile habitat areas, such as that of the mission blue butterfly, are not on the valley floor where the fire road and trail are. Where habitat restoration and fragile areas do exist, fence and signage should take care of the problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Laurie Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1389 **Comment Id:** 352433 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have no problem changing the snowy plover beach to no dogs allowed. I do

want to note, however, that I frequently see small children racing through this area, disturbing nesting areas and frightening birds. I also see this behavior on a regular basis on all the beaches and closed off sensitive areas. Parents need to educate their children that it is not OK to harass wildlife. I see this behavior far more in children while it is extremely unusual to see dogs chasing wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen L Dooley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357468 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The claims regarding bird habitat & nesting (Snowy Plover, Bank Swallow, etc.) are inaccurate and have been repeatedly disputed. They are not based on scientific observation. Similarly, the impact of dogs on plant life has been exaggerated and not substantiated by any standard or scientific means.

Organization: Dog City Tours

Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6622 **Comment Id:** 367476 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Snowy Plovers? There is a lot of vacant coastline and how many dogs are dedicated bird chasers anyway? Fishing and crabbing from shore doesn't drive these birds away also.

Organization:

Commenter: A. C Eisenberger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6637 **Comment Id:** 367564 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Lastly, the dogs have never been a threat to the bank swallows over these many years. I've been walking my dogs off leash at Ft. Funston for at least 20 years. I ask why do the swallows return, year after year, despite the incursion of humans, dune buggies, horses, dogs, hang gliders, heavy equipment and attempts to alter their ecosystem.

Organization:

Commenter: Mort S Gensberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Commenters questioned the presence of resources related to special status species in areas of the GGNRA.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1159 **Comment Id:** 351798 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Ranger said they probably weren't snowy plovers since they are really hard to find and hiding out in the dunes. If I can't find them when I am looking for them, how is my

leashed dog going to even have the opportunity to disturb them? If they are hiding out in the dunes, then just ban dogs from the dunes. I never see any dogs up there anyway (I do see lots of people hanging out on the dunes).

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 510 **Comment Id:** 351838 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: GGNRA DOG MANAGEMENT AT MUIR BEACH It seems that the salmon have not returned to the creek, at least not yet. I was told by a park employee that it was doubtful that the salmon would ever return because they had been gone so long and because the creek still dries up in the winter. In any case, people represent a much greater hazard to the salmon than dogs do.

Organization:

Commenter: Penelope Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368263 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are an insignificant issue related to the Bank Swallows (page 276). Currently the crows/ravens are a menace to any small bird in the Fort Funston vicinity. The EIS/ SEIS refers to a report by Black 1996 (page 325). Black's report predates the invasion of Fort Funston by the crows/ravens.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The EIS/SEIS fails to establish that Lessingia ever populated Fort Funston. In fact, the EIS/SEIS relates to Lessingnia previously having been located in the Lake Merced area (page 986) but admits that there is no documentation that Lessignia ever populated Fort Funston. There are numerous differences in the natural conditions between Lake Merced and Fort Funston and the EIS/SEIS fails to establish any basis for Lessignia ever having been present at Fort Funston.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369188 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS assumes species are present in areas where there is no record of their presence. In other places, there is inconsistent information about the presence of species.

Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you read the Affected Environment section carefully, you will learn that there are no plant species which are endangered or threatened on Federal or State registers that have designated "critical habitat" in the GGNRA. If we look at the ESA and the enabling legislation for the GGNRA, there is no reason to displace recreation to enhance the growth of any of these listed plants in the GGNRA. However, we see that GGNRA management has displaced recreational access to plant these plants with regularity, the most egregious location being Fort Funston.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 6 **Comment Id:** 337958 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: At Ocean Beach, where I live, huge numbers of dogs run off leash in the on leash areas on a daily basis. Today (Friday) is a sunny day at the beach, and I can guarantee you that there will be DOZENS of dogs down there - - and their owners - - who will be violating the CURRENT regulations. The dogs crap all over the beach (and owners dont' scoop), chase birds (including threatened species), jump up on people that want nothing to do with them (and have destroyed my headset for my iphone on one occasion when a dog jumped up and clawed my chest), and generally create havoc. Many dog owners are responsible with their pets, but many are not. When I have (courteously) informed some dog owners that their dog was off leash in an on leash area, I have been physically threatened, verbally abused and harassed.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Hill N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 45 **Comment Id:** 344092 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Yesterday my wife and I watched as a pit bull chased a flock of small white shorebirds back and forth, harassing the endangered species. The owner did nothing and ignored us when we mentioned that he needs to control his animal.

Organization:

Commenter: J Zolli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 137 **Comment Id:** 346293 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Your own studies indicate an inverse relationship between off-leash dogs and protection of the snowy plover (the lowest populations were when dogs were completely banned, the highest when dogs were completely off leash)

Organization:

Commenter: John C Weaver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 223 **Comment Id:** 350140 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Your proposed policies are in contradiction to the conclusions you draw in the study. Also on the Oakwood Valley Trail, your policy indicates that you want to protect the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. No lupine grows on either the north or south side of the loop.

Organization:

Commenter: Laurie Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 395 **Comment Id:** 351311 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The NPS has failed to identify important habitats for wildlife. The Ft. Funston Bluffs do not harbor endangered species. The only wildlife seen at this location are ravens and a few redtailed hawks. More important are the bluffs right above the beach, where the cliff swallows build their nests, but the NPS has failed to protect these birds and have concentrated and diverted their attention to the upper bluf

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Gam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1023 **Comment Id:** 351447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am especially concerned about the protection of wildlife aspects of the proposed rules. For as long as I have been watching and sometimes monitoring the Snowy Plovers in the Bay Area I have seen the population continuously decline. One small step is to prohibit dogs from the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area, and require dogs to be leashed at the Ocean Beach Snowy Plover area

Organization:

Commenter: Helen A Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1177 **Comment Id:** 351915 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: One last comment: again from the 12-8-2011 SF Dog official comments: apparently there is no evidence that the Western Snowy Plover or Bank Swallow have been impacted by dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Lancaster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1432 **Comment Id:** 352546 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: At Crissy Field, the area where I spend the most time as a runner and bird-watcher, off-leash dogs are harassing and killing the endangered plovers. There are numerous other places where people can allow their dogs to run wild (Golden Gate Park? Dolores Park? Alta Vista Park? The Presidio?) without needing to jeopardize an endangered species.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1400 **Comment Id:** 352447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is rarely the case when I don't see off leash dogs running through the new plantings, damaging the work to preserve habitat for endangered species. I have been afraid several times for my safety and that of my son because of pitbull and similar breeds off-leash, as well as other large dogs chasing wildly through the area with their owners far from any ability to

curb and control their dogs. I realize there are a number of respectful dog owners, but it only takes one neglectful owner to precipitate a tragedy.

Organization:

Commenter: Summer Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1468 **Comment Id:** 352851 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no proof the dogs effect the snowy plover at all, and their decreasing numbers is more likely due to the second largest city in California being 5 feet away. Most environmental studies say the plover mates in Salt lake, Utah, anyway - another piece of science ignored.

Organization:

Commenter: Tom C Jagger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 704 **Comment Id:** 352988 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Some parts of the GGNRA have become so thick with dogs that they are now essentially giant dog runs. Off-leash dogs menace the colonies of threatened Snowy Plovers at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. Park staff spend large chunks of time managing con- flicts between dogs and people, dogs and wildlife, and among dogs themselves.

Organization:

Commenter: Celine Lielle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1555 **Comment Id:** 353095 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My friends have seen dogs in GGNRA chasing endangered snowy plover.

Organization:

Commenter: Sandra Yagi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1661 **Comment Id:** 353492 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The bird experts admit now it isnt the dogs that are causing the problems but its in their cheapest interests to blame them. At Ocean Beach,where the dogs are most off leash,the Plovers flourish.

Organization:

Commenter: Cheis L Jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1826 **Comment Id:** 354267 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have also witnessed them go after birds (including snowy plovers at Ocean

Beach.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1856 **Comment Id:** 354380 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a neighbor and volunteer at the Presidio, I frequently encounter dog walkers with dogs off leash. Many times the dogs are running in areas that are clearly marked as sensitive habitat. Although I am a dog lover, I still believe that there must be strict rules to manage dogs in the Presidio. No dog should be off leash in sensitive areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean Colvin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1868 **Comment Id:** 354397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My primary concern is that the Snowy Plover Protection Area at Ocean Beach has become an off-leash dog play area during the restricted seasons, with no enforcement of park policies for the Protected Area. This has resulted in increased harassment of the Snowy Plover populations in the Protected Area.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1868 **Comment Id:** 354399 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is important to note that the number of off-leash dogs in the Snowy Plover Protection Area increase during the dawn and dusk periods, which coincides with the feeding times of the Snowy Plovers, significantly increasing harassment impacts on the Plovers. I have also noticed a shift in the feeding time patterns of the Snowy Plovers in the Protected Area, where they now come out to feed later in the twilight hours when there is less harassment as they are less people and dogs around then. This however reduces their feeding time window and their ability to find food, which likely impacts their overall wellbeing and population numbers.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2706 **Comment Id:** 357118 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have seen a marked increase in the number of dogs on the trails of Mori Point and Rockaway, as well as the beaches of Linda Mar and Sharp Park. That means there are many more off-leash dogs chasing the birds, even in the areas that are considered nesting places for our little snowy plovers.

Organization:

Commenter: Helen D Gonzales **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3334 **Comment Id:** 358172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On Ocean Beach I see dogs chasing the Endangered Snowy Plover!!
Organization: JeepNey Projects Worldwide
Commenter: David Tomb **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2445 **Comment Id:** 358946 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The NPS claims the needs of the snowy plover trump everything, but in 14 years they have not updated their science, even when proved wrong, such as claiming dog shadows frightened the plovers from nesting when the trajectory of the sun makes this impossible.
Organization:
Commenter: Katherine R Garn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4043 **Comment Id:** 360323 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I tire of seeing off-leash dogs in areas where they are prohibited such as Snowy Plover nesting beaches- -not to mention the habit of certain dog owners to leave their full dog waste bags on trail sides.
Organization:
Commenter: Kerry Wilcox **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361561 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Sweeney Ridge I prefer option 19A with the addition of all of the Baquiano trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica to its conclusion at the Portola Discovery site. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dog walking given the historical use of area (once an active military site, 4x4 vehicle trails, gas/water/electricity rights of ways, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation. "No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing. "Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. "Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific

damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361562 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston: I prefer option 16A over any other. I do not prefer options 16B,C, D, E, or F for the following reasons: "Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Funston trail systems. "Over stating of damage caused by dog usage given the historical use of area (once an active military site, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation. "No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing. "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural, open park setting. "Fort Funston is nationally-recognized as on of the greatest dog parks in the country. This kind of open space is not available anywhere else in the greater bay area. "Is enforcement realistic? It would seem by virtue of the vast, interconnecting trail system, the GGNRA would have to resort to excessive enforcement measures to regulate the trail use. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking. "Fort Funston has no real appeal to any other user group due to its cliffs, steep terrain, and climate. It is my opinion that restricting dog use will not invite the perceived low-impact user(hikers), rather it will invite an element of transients, loiters, and trespassers. The dog users are both the stewards and proprietors of this land; the presence of such unwanted elements is diverted by virtue of the presence of dog enthusiasts among others.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361563 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I Prefer 17A I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (4x4 vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a rural park setting. "Area is in a densely populated area with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking. "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking. "Symbolic fencing and signs have been effective in keeping people as well as people with dogs out of sensitive areas

Organization:
Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361564 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I prefer 20E I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle club/ motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.) "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a park setting. "Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.
Organization:
Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361565 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Rancho Corral Tierra I prefer 21A "I do not support the the preferred alternative of 21F due to "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on or off leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.) "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a park setting. "Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash or off dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by dog walking. "Has been unregulated for 30 years "More research needed due to only being a park for less than two years
Organization:
Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5137 **Comment Id:** 362266 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: OCEAN BEACH is the other area with which I have extensive knowledge. I survey Snowy Plovers there every week or two between late July and the end of April. I bird the north and south ends of it frequently and walk there regularly. Dogs on the beach are an absolute hazard to all wildlife. Off leash dogs are the primary offenders. Though some owners intentionally sic their dogs on flocks of birds, more often they allow them to run through bird flocks, or they throw a ball which sends their dog running into the birds. Even dog walkers with controlled dogs pose a problem. The birds have no way of knowing whether a given dog will go

after them or not. A dog is a predator, so any close approach is very likely going to result in the birds flying off

Organization:

Commenter: Joan and Dan Murphy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363303 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Countless times seeing dogs chasing the protected snowy plovers down into the water. Owner does nothing. Very sad.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4340 **Comment Id:** 363790 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Common Raven is nest predator of Bank Swallows. However, ravens are also attracted to FOFU because visitors feed them. Flock of ravens often perch near the entrance and/or hang around cars waiting for handouts. For instance: a driver feeds the ravens; a dog walker comes with dogs that chase the birds; and, the driver and the walker think that it is hilarious.

Organization: Fort Funston Nursery Volunteer

Commenter: Ingrid E Cabada **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4340 **Comment Id:** 363791 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: "Alternative A and B": Habitat Protection Area to protect native plant communities. There are few native plants growing at this site. About ten years ago, when the site was fenced in, dog walkers protested. FOFU nursery volunteers were told not to enter the site when lead deposits were found from its former use as a rifle range. Instead of the Habitat Protection Area, protect the original Bank Swallow Site, which has been kept weed free by volunteers for the last seventeen years. Rotting fence posts, falling cables and blowing sand are an invitation for new trails. After a blow out a population of Beach Pea (Latyrus littoralis rare in San Francisco) appeared, but new social trails could put them in peril.

Organization: Fort Funston Nursery Volunteer

Commenter: Ingrid E Cabada **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6165 **Comment Id:** 365689 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When I walk on Ocean Beach and I see 50 people at a time trampling these dunes, and the dry sand transitional area to the wet beach, which you yourself admitted to me that this is an important area for the Snowy Plover; I ask you again Frank Dean: Why isn't this area fenced to protect the Snowy Plover? It seems if you really were concerned with wildlife you

would have this area fenced to protect the Snowy Plover and stop several hundred people from trampling the dunes and the transitional area from the dunes to the beach every week. You claim to be protecting wildlife by trying to deny dog owners and their dogs long standing off leash privileges in the lands known as the GGNRA, but it seems if you were actually really concerned with the protection of wildlife you would have these dunes fenced.

Organization:

Commenter: deborah l riat **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365753 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sweeny Ridge/Cattle Hill I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge trail system. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if a dog is leashed it will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing. Visitor use of Sweeeny Ridge is relativity low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal. Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365754 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A) I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to

sensitive habit areas and species. Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365755 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E) I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the new Devils Slide Trail. Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366916 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: And it's not just Bank Swallows and Snowy Plovers that are negatively impacted by dogs in GGNRA. Too many times I have witnessed off-leash dogs in NPS areas chasing after and harassing birds and other wildlife. A friend has related to me how, on a weekly basis, she witnesses a professional dog walker release up to 6 dogs to run and chase each other and wildlife in Oakwood Valley, trampling and tearing up the host plant to the endangered mission blue butterfly. I've heard other friends describe witnessing off-leash dogs in national parks attacking or harassing pinnipeds and chasing after shorebirds, including the threatened Snowy Plover. These reports lend more validation to the argument that dogs- -especially off-leash dogs- -have no place in national parks.

Organization:
Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6622 **Comment Id:** 367475 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: How many dogs climb cliffs to disturb cliff dwelling swallows. Scared by dog shadows? Give me a break!
Organization:
Commenter: A. C Eisenberger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6624 **Comment Id:** 367485 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And of course, the shorebirds along the beaches are impacted the most by the loose running of dogs along the beaches, especially the snowy plovers.
Organization:
Commenter: Heather Evergreen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6512 **Comment Id:** 367635 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Many years ago, the GGNRA decided that dogs and people walking on the sand dunes in the area above where the bank swallows nest, were most likely negatively impacting the swallows, especially when nesting and raising their young. To that end, they fenced off a large area above the cliffs were the swallows nest. It wasn't long until several of us noticed that the swallows were no longer seen in the now "protected area". Instead they were regularly flying in areas where we really hadn't seen them that often before. It became clear they were following us, flying above as we walked. You could see that they were feeding on insects that flew up as a result. We also saw something we had rarely witnessed before. Large numbers of sea gullls and ravens sitting on the dunes, by the edge of the cliff, above the bank swallow nests. They would fly down, pluck baby swallows right out of their nests, flying back up to the dunes where they sat and ate the baby birds. It was very hard to watch. When we used to walk along the dunes in that area, the predator birds were kept at bay. But by fencing off the sand dunes above the bank swallow nesting area to keep people and their dogs from walking there, the GGNRA created a safe haven for the sea gulls and ravens. They could feed on baby bank swallows at will. It was heartbreaking.
Organization:
Commenter: Jean Kind **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3407 **Comment Id:** 368256 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: At Crissy Field I have seen dogs chase rare plovers and catch them and other bird species in the lagoon, chase the blue heron and it is horrific not to protect these areas from

harm to wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 599 **Comment Id:** 368339 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Cited studies are generally older data from 1996 to ~2008, do not adequately assess the impact of the late 2006 and 2007 Rule requiring leashes from Jul-May (36 CFR 1.5). There is no reference to the change in snowy plover populations from 2006-2013. In addition the EIS state there are many non-dog factors that effect the number of plovers overwintering in Ocean Beach SPPA, so you dont even know what affect if any are due to dogs. Banning dogs from the beach is a heavy-handed attempt to fix a perceived problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Timothy Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2420 **Comment Id:** 368496 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I've seen the young plovers heading to the ocean. They are sensitive to what's going on around them, but they're not hatching year round. I've witness dogs chasing birds, but it's not usually the case. A bigger issue that I see: kids playing in the dunes and homeless people sleeping in the dunes. Isn't this the sensitive snowy plover habitat?

Organization:

Commenter: bill randt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369332 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Internal GGNRA records show the GGNRA bargained with USFWS in 1996, sacrificing our off-leash recreational opportunities in order to get USFWS to agree to allow bulldozing in this same area of Ocean Beach. The ESA is very clear that it is not permissible to modify the habitat of an endangered or threatened species when they are not present, but expected to return. One example would be the prohibition of the removal of trees that hold an eagle's nest, even when the eagle is not present or utilizing the nest. We understand the GGNRA is modifying the beach in this area to minimize the effects of erosion and the drifting of sand on to the Promenade and Great Highway. The GGNRA has refused to acknowledge in any significant fashion that erosion and the progressive collapse of the shoreline limits the areas where the plover can roost and forage, as well as the quality of foodsource for the plover at Ocean Beach. The narrowing beach puts the plover in closer and closer proximity to all users of the beach, thereby increasing the disturbance to the plovers. These conditions will progress despite the GGNRA's move to ban dogs entirely.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For the plovers observed roosting at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, humans and off-leash dogs are not restricting their access to resources because the plovers are indeed there. The second alternative is that humans and off-leash dogs are altering the actual or perceived quality of these sites. The most logical conclusion is the presence of humans and their off-leash dogs reduces the presence and/or activity of prey species.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369424 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Beginning in 1991, the GGNRA/ NPS began destroying the Fort Funston ecosystem with the premise being protection of the California state-threatened Bank Swallow. The GGNRA/ NPS maintained that that recreational activity and "exotic" plants were having a profound negative impact on the Bank Swallow. The GGNRA/ NPS never conducted an environmental impact analysis or vital monitoring as required by Federal law before beginning this ecological destruction. For decades, the Bank Swallow population had been thriving at Fort Funston, with their population increasing steadily even as off-leash dog walking was legally permitted and visitor use increased. In 1982, there were 229 burrows, 417 in 1987, and 550 in 1989- -providing anecdotal evidence that dogs and Bank Swallows co-exist and thrive.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369427 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: After four years of closures of areas adjacent to the Bank Swallow burrows to off-leash recreation and vegetation revision, in 1995 the number of Bank Swallow burrows plummeted from 924 to 713. A simple review of the scientific literature confirms that Bank Swallows are very tolerant of "human disturbance" at nest sites. Indeed, "many colonies are in human-made sites...such as sand and gravel quarries and road cuts." (Garrison, B., "Bank Swallow," The Birds of North America, No. 414 (1999), at p. 6.) Mr. Garrison is a California Department of Fish and Game Biologist and an expert on the Bank Swallow. In fact, the only GGNRA/ NPS study to evaluate the dramatic drop in numbers of the Bank Swallow concluded that increased predation, not recreational activity, was negatively affecting the birds. (Chow, N., "1994-95 Bank Swallow Annual Report", US04906-32.) In 1996, the GGNRA/ NPS failed to document the colony size, and claims to have lost all data for 1997. In 1998, the number of burrows had dropped to 140, and the GGNRA/ NPS closed off the entire slope of coastal bluffs below the hang gliders.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369430 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In 1998, the Bank Swallow colony fled the "Bank Swallow Protection Area," to the "exotic" ecology and recreational activity along the south cliffs of Fort Funston. As a general rule of survival, birds leave areas where they are under stress. Despite the obvious devastation to the Bank Swallow colony, the GGNRA/ NPS failed to analyze the impact of unleashed dogs on controlling predators of the Bank Swallow. (Hatch Report, p. 85, lines 10-16.) NPS Head Ranger J. Milestone indicated the dogs might have protected the Bank Swallows by impacting the weasel population. (US03944.) Additionally, observations indicate that the very habitat the GGNRA/ NPS was destroying was the habitat most suitable for the Fort Funston Bank Swallow. Such observations confirm that ice plant rootlets are used by Bank Swallows to construct nests. (US04062-3.)

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369433 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In fact, NPS documents confirm that Bank Swallow experts do not agree with the NPS/GGNRA contention that the creation of native plant "flyover" habitat is necessary for the Bank Swallows. Notes of a March 16, 2000 phone conversation with Barry Garrison from the California Fish & Game Department, one of the nation's foremost experts on California Bank Swallows, confirm that he "doesn't feel need flyover" (USPR001625)....."doesn't necessarily agree that they need a flyover to persist." (USPROD01624). William Shields, Professor of Biology at SUNY, elected fellow of American Ornithologist's Union, leader of SUNY's Conservation Biology concentration (in letter to GGNRA re: closures at Fort Funston, October 2000), reiterates the Bank Swallows tolerance of human and pet presence and their lack of appreciation for "native plants." "The poor arguments presented in their (GGNRA) plans make little sense to me. The Bank Swallow like other swallows is quite suited to live with humans and their pets" and "... I do not understand or condone what I believe are their misrepresentations about the needs and safety of the Bank Swallows breeding in the cliffs. ... the notion that the swallows would do better by having more species of insects or even more insects on the short fl yway between their breeding burrows and their main foraging sites at the nearby lake is a major stretch and smacks of special pleading to me."

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have just detailed the closure of some 35 acres at Fort Funston for the purpose of reintroducing native plants, presumably including lessingia. Clearly the GGNRA's native plant "experiment" has encompassed 35 acres and been ongoing since 1991. When will they admit failure? The plants they intend to reintroduce such as lessingia became extirpated in the area and there has been no documentation to show dogs came to Fort Funston and selectively

dug up all the lessingia and left only the iceplant the Army Corp of Engineers planted to prosper. Perhaps the soils, weather, or other forces of nature have modified the environment at Fort Funston such that lessingia are unsuited to survival there.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA160746

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/04/2014)

TE4000 Threatened And Endangered Species: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives (Substantive)

1. **Commenters were concerned about the impacts of dogs on special status species, and felt that protecting species and species habitat from dogs was important. Many commenters desired regulations that would support the protection of special status species.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 165 **Comment Id:** 349917 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Natural areas need protection from dogs. There are plenty of accessible parks in the area already; protecting our beaches for endangered species like the Western Snowy Plover are crucial.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert P Toleno **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1025 **Comment Id:** 351448 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am concerned that the Draft Management Plan does not adequately address the problems created by the rapid growth in dog walking within the GGNRA. This is particularly a problem at Ocean Beach where dogs interfere with the nesting Snowy Plover. Simply requiring dog owners to keep their dogs on leash will be ineffective without enforcement. Dog owners already routinely ignore leash requirements because of inadequate enforcement. Without increased enforcement they will also ignore leash requirements at the Snowy Plover habitat.

Organization:

Commenter: Joseph Majer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 769 **Comment Id:** 353256 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The number of dogs running off leash in park areas continues to increase every year. I am an animal lover and I live with a small dog. I feel there are plenty of places to take a dog off leash and that we need to set aside park areas to help protect animals such as the Snowy Plover. Additionally, there is a Burrowing Owl atop the rocks at south Ocean Beach, just north of Fort Funston. Dogs pose the largest threat to birds and other wildlife. Dog owners who insist that, "My dog doesn't chase _____," are part of the problem. They believe they maintain control of their dogs while they are off leash, but evidence has shown time and again that dogs on the hunt will not respond to their owner's voices. A Burrowing Owl was killed in Berkeley last year, and it likely was the victim of an off-leash dog. Please consider that dogs should not be allowed in some sensitive wildlife habitats, and they should be required to be on a leash in other areas.

Organization:
Commenter: Lisa E Hern **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3426 **Comment Id:** 359207 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please allow protections for endangered and threatened animals and plants where people, dogs/horses can not enter. There are ways to allow beaches to be shared without damaging the future of small defenseless birds whose limited energy is easily compromised by running/barking/sniffing dogs or jogging/walking people ... Certain areas must indeed to set aside to protect the animals who have no one feeding, walking, protecting them. PROTECT THE SNOWY PLOVERS.
Organization:
Commenter: Sue Morgan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5793 **Comment Id:** 364314 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a CA Species of Special Concern, the NPS is will within its authority and is, frankly, duty-bound to afford the highest possible protection for the plovers. Not only will the plovers benefit from strictly limiting access for dogs, rare plants, amphibians, and microhabitats well benefit, too.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366935 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am concerned that Alternative F would not adequately provide protection for contiguous habitat beyond the Oakwood trail and fire road junction and would increase the potential for dog/coyote interaction. Nor would Alternative F provide protection for potential habitat for species of concern, such as the mission blue butterfly habitat nearby and possible habitat for the northern spotted owl.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters questioned the impacts analysis of impacts to special status species and felt the studies used to support the impacts analysis were not sound. Many commenters suggested that the impacts of dogs were not as high as suggested in the analysis.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 289 **Comment Id:** 350483 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The whole explanation that dogs need to be banned or leashed to save some

birds is a ridiculous canard. Over the last twenty years I've owned two, very active Australian Shepherds, and not once has either of them ever caught a bird. Perhaps, this has been overlooked, but you might note that they have wings and can fly. Catching a bird is unquestionably a very rare event that I cannot ever recall having seen. I would further note that these precious birds whose wellbeing evidently trumps the interest of every other living being have rest of the California coast enjoy, where days if not weeks no doubt go by between their being disturbed by a human, much less a dog.

Organization:

Commenter: ed j kiernan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 435 **Comment Id:** 351364 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Comments specific to Pedro Point Headlands: This plan's preferred alternative B is not the best option. NPS draws its conclusions by stating that dogs on leash in areas other than Multi use coastal trail would have an impact on red legged frogs, garter snakes and Mission blue Butterflies. None of these species exist in this area and there are no bodies of water anywhere on the site as mentioned in the plan. The NPS analysis of the preferred alternative is highly flawed due to this non-existent impact on these endangered species.

Organization:

Commenter: Samuel Casillas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1275 **Comment Id:** 352223 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are no plant species which are endangered or threatened on Federal or State registers that have designated "critical habitat" in the GGNRA. Displacing recreation to enhance the growth of any of these listed plants is not required by the ESA and violates the enabling legislation for the GGNRA.

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4192 **Comment Id:** 355964 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If there were any peer reviewed, scientific studies that actually show the dogs are causing harm, I would support changes that would actually help the environment, unlike NPS's fencing off acres to the public which not only did NOT protect the bank swallows, it gave birds of prey posts on which to sit and pick off the birds. The birds that were not eaten, left.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3100 **Comment Id:** 357904 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is evidence in the scientific literature that off-leash dogs can have negative impacts on breeding and overwintering Western Snowy Plovers in other locations. However, nowhere in the SEIS is evidence provided that leashed dogs impact the Western Snowy Plover. Throughout the SEIS, the NPS cites a 2001 article by Lafferty to infer that on-leash dogs disturb plovers. The data in this article includes only two events of leashed dogs disturbing shorebirds and there is no evidence that these birds were plovers. This article actually states, "Leashing reduces both the probability that a dog disturbed birds and numbers of birds per disturbance." To use this as evidence that plover disturbance by leashed dogs is a problem is disingenuous.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6246 **Comment Id:** 366196 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Specifically regarding Fort Funston, per the SEIS there is just one native plant species that is federally endangered, the lessingia. The locations of this plant and damage to this plant by dogs is not documented in the SEIS. Substantially restricting dog-walking access in order to potentially protect a single plant species is an imbalanced response that places one plant above the recreating needs of SF residents. The vast majority of the upper Funston dunes and trails have been covered by non-native species since the military used this area decades ago. Contrary to the SEIS, these upper Funston dunes are not "denuded" but rather the ice-plant and other plants routinely rejuvenate, and the dunes shift with the weather over the paved trails.

Organization:

Commenter: Rhonda Vitanye **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 550 **Comment Id:** 368320 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are no plant species which are endangered or threatened on Federal or State registers that have designated "critical habitat" in the GGNRA. Displacing recreation to enhance the growth of any of these listed plants is not required by the ESA and violates the enabling legislation for the GGNRA. However, we see that GGNRA management has displaced recreational access to plant these plants with regularity, the most egregious location being Fort Funston

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Some commenters made suggestions for more stringent regulations to protect special status species given the impacts of dogs on these species, while others suggested that less stringent regulations be put in place based on the impacts of dogs on special status species.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1450 **Comment Id:** 352579 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: NONE of the alternatives for Ocean Beach allow dogs off leash west of Lincoln to Sloat. Leashing dogs here is completely untenable. This is the most urban stretch of beach north of LA. Human concerns trump the birds on this one. The Snowy Plover can find another place to roost, it's really just that simple. We can't turn back the clock. It's too late. The humans have already arrived on this little stretch of beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian W Veit **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1682 **Comment Id:** 353567 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Summary of the Management Report states clearly that the impact of leashed dogs to the endangered red legged frogs, garter snakes and butterflies would be negligible and would be minor to other wildlife. If the ecology is not threatened, such a restrictive policy is totally unjustified. It is hard for me to comprehend

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4851 **Comment Id:** 361633 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In San Mateo County the EIS states that dogs could have a negligible impact on endangered species. With some fencing or other mitigations, we bet this could come down to no impact. It seems as though this wasn't even considered.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeri and John E Flinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5200 **Comment Id:** 362588 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Invaluable wildlife, such as the snowy plover (and all other native species), must be protected from off-leash dogs. Off-leash dog running should not be permitted anywhere in GGNRA, but if, for political reasons, it is, it should be restricted to areas of no habitat value where native wildlife will not be harmed.

Organization:

Commenter: Trent W Orr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365572 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Rodeo Beach and Lagoon A ROLA is established on Rodeo Beach and dog use is expanded to the entire north beach, south to the sea stacks. A post and cable fence would be constructed along the west side of the lagoon. It is acknowledged that such a fence would discourage but not physically exclude dogs and people from the lagoon area. Dogs of certain

breeds would find it most inviting to leap over or under a fence to fun and swim in the lagoon. Water quality and habitat degradation are noted as causes of the listing of Tidewater Goby, which inhabit the lagoon. The discussion reports water quality and habitat degradation, both of which would result from dogs swimming in the lagoon, are reasons this species is listed as federally endangered. Protection of any birds that may land on the beach depends on off-leash dogs being under voice control. How will the NPS assure that dogs are actually under voice control and that their owners even are paying attention to their activities? The justification for allowing unleashed dogs here is that shorebird counts on this beach are low. It does not appear to have been considered that the numbers are likely low because of dog use. Impacts are expected to increase from commercial dog walkers but are not expected to increase enough to change the "threshold level" although what that level would be is not defined. Again, the effectiveness of these restrictions will depend on compliance which in turn will depend on monitoring and enforcement. Assuming compliance is especially troublesome at this location because few, if any, dogs are actually under voice control.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366905 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The DMP is also inadequate for protecting Snowy Plover habitat because it does not include the entire portion of Crissy Field and Ocean Beach. It draws imaginary boundaries that do not comport with typical visitor's understanding of GGNRA, and the plovers are not, to the best of my knowledge, able to discern where these boundaries are either. A typical visitor with a dog will not always know if he or she is entering an area where pets are restricted, especially if the regulatory signs are vandalized or torn down by individuals who disagree with the rules, as too frequently happens. This, again, will invite violations of pet regulations as people claim ignorance or confusion over the exact boundary. A closure prohibiting pets- -on- or off-leash- -should apply to all of Ocean Beach and Crissy Field.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367537 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Two plant species (Marin dwarf flax and the SF Lessinga) have been identified at Baker Beach and the adjacent high bluffs as an endangered species. Yes, we want to protect them and this could include implementing mitigation measures like appropriate post and cable fencing and appropriate signage. However, the DSEIS omits analysis of the design of the built environment altogether. Again, there is no factual or scientific basis to restrict dogs under voice control at Upper Fort Mason, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ft. Miley, Lands End, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston or the other areas under consideration in Marin and San Mateo counties.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6645 **Comment Id:** 368198 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point: We suggest that the Mori Point Headlands Trail be modified to allow on-leash dog access. We also recommend connecting the Mori Point Bluff Trail to provide a loop. We believe the likelihood of either the redlegged frog or the San Francisco garter snake being harmed or negatively affected is extremely remote

Organization: Pacifica City Council

Commenter: Mary Nihart **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 193 **Comment Id:** 350082 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Our family support owners keeping thier dogs on leashes on Ocean Beach, with more resources provided for consistent enforcement However, since many dog owners consistently flaunt this requirement, unfortunately, there may need to be an outright ban on dogs in this area. I have seen unleashed dogs on ocean beach repeatedly attack pelicans and other seabirds, to the point of thier deaths, so this is not just a theoretical concern. Our family lives 400 yards from the dunes, and often walk on the beach, typically on a daily basis. While some dog owners are responsible, others see the wildlife on the beach as something to entertain their dogs. I've regularly seen dogs encouraged by thier owners to chase flocks of shore birds attempting o feed and rest by the shore. They have a particularly unfortunate habit of separating a small shore bird from a flock, and chasing it to exhaustion. While dog owners in a city would prefer to have thier pets run unfettered in this area, the interests of the shore birds should also be taken into consideration, especially for the snowy plovers. Some dog owners go as far a video taping this wildlife harassing and attacking activity of thier dogs, apparently to add to the entertainment factor. Interestingly, owners will have thier doges leased on the street, but then purposely take them off leash on the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen McCowin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 206 **Comment Id:** 350111 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If the snowy plover is so delicate that it can't survive with dogs passing by on a leash, maybe we should let evolution take over and stop worrying about protecting it. Let it go

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 243 **Comment Id:** 350342 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In a nut shell dogs and there owners have become the scapegoat for your policy and decision making and that banning them from Ocean Beach will have little to no beneficial impact to the snowy plover or other wildlife in this habitat. It saddens me that in order to appease general opinion of the few and the misguided, I am speaking of the fact-less recommendations of institutions that I am shamefully a member of-namely the Sierra Club and Audubon Society, that dogs are incorrectly perceived as a threat to the well-being of the snowy plover. Indeed there has never been a study done to see if there is a direct impact between dogs the behavior of the snowy plover. It should be noted that as people making decisions, common sense should be used when creating laws that affect habitat. It is obvious that dogs, ranger trucks, human children, surfers, as well as little old ladies with large pocket books who hate dogs, all contribute to the stress of the snowy plover. They do not however prevent the snowy plover from inhabiting the dunes and upper beach areas of Ocean Beach. Indeed there has been little research in finding out why snowy plovers would choose to use urban areas as habitat when the majority shoreline in their

range is much more pristine!
Organization: NSTA
Commenter: Fred A Andrews **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 446 **Comment Id:** 351381 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs do not impact the Snowy Plover at Ocean Beach. In fact the Snowy Plover mates in Utah and migrates here for food. They are still here. There numbers may be lower, but because This is a city, not because of he dogs
Organization:
Commenter: Tom Jagger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 488 **Comment Id:** 351774 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: GGNRA Dogplan/EIS Pg 920: The Document States: During a long-term monitoring survey conducted from 1994 to 2006, 48 off-leash dogs were observed chasing western snowy plovers (Ward and Ablog 2006). 1. This Ward and Ablog citation is not applicable to SPPA since it is a study of Crissy Field WPA, not SPPA. 2. 48 dogs over a period of 12 years results in about 4 dogs a year. That seems pretty low impact In Chapter 3 pg (252/253) of the EIS it states: The NPS began western snowy plover surveys at Ocean Beach in 1988& The average number of plovers observed per survey during the winter was highest in the 1994-1995 survey period, at more than 54 plovers, and was lowest in 1999, at less than 13 plovers (NPS 2010b). The winter population of western snowy plovers was on average above 30 plovers per winter survey in 2002-2006 (NPS 2010b). Therefore, the numbers of western snowy plovers vary year to year based on a variety of factors, including conditions at other wintering sites, the width of the beach, the severity of storms, and other influences. &(NPS 2010b, 22). It seems the population of these birds is variable form year to year with many other influences that dont include dogs. I was on Ocean Beach in Late October and counted at least 50-60 snowy plovers in one small area. It appears the situation is improving and no action is necessary (Alternative A).
Organization:
Commenter: Tim Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 488 **Comment Id:** 351776 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Each time an individual study is cited in this document, it says dogs may influence could disturb-nothing conclusive. It sounds pretty speculative to me. The summary rational statement for Alternative A states: &potentially limit their use of preferred habitat and interrupt roosting or foraging behavior, which causes birds to expend energy; frequent disturbance of this type affects fat reserves needed for migration and breeding. I see these birds running around constantly expending energy when no dogs are present, would a brief encounter with a dog really matter? The expense of energy would be incremental. In addition, frequent

disturbance doesnt appear to be happening. I walk my dog every morning and evening on Ocean Beach. I see lots of snowy plovers and have never seen a dog go after any them. To me that would suggest disturbances are occasional at best. Table 8 pg 246 indicates: Critical habitat has been designated for this species (Snowy Plover), but it does not occur in GGNRA. If Ocean Beach SPPA is not a critical habitat, then stable or increasing numbers of the birds overwintering implies no change to existing rules are needed.

Organization:

Commenter: Tim Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1159 **Comment Id:** 351797 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If a new rule is put in place to ban dogs from Ocean Beach SPPA, how will you know if it was successful in achieving the desired goal with respect to snowy plovers? The EIS already states there are many factors (none of which include dogs) influence the number of snowy plovers that overwinter on the beach. So, if the number goes up or down, you won't even know if the dogs (or lack there of) had anything to do with it.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1186 **Comment Id:** 351936 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA has no federally designated critical habitat. Therefore there is no reason to ban dogs citing harm to such habitat.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeffrey and Hoa Nebenzahl and Tran **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1450 **Comment Id:** 352581 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Nor will the birds really even be impacted. There are plenty of other secluded beaches on the pacific coast for these birds. CEQA does provide for over-ruling environmental concerns if they are recognized. This is one of those cases. Enforcing this leash only rule will NOT result in any environmental improvement, but it will do a lot of damage to the many human beings who live here.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian W Veit **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 663 **Comment Id:** 352855 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Another point is wildlife. Dogs disrupt areas that are habitat, mostly nesting sites for birds. Unmanaged dogs can do even more damage to the environment. Birds are the most harassed animal species, shorebirds in particular. Shorebirds do not nest in trees; preferred

nesting sites are in sand dunes and grasses above tidal areas. Dogs will walk over nests, chase birds, kill adult birds, exhaust the bird's energy resulting in death, and frighten nesting birds to the point of those birds not going back to the nesting site. If there are chicks or eggs present, death of the young will occur. A prime example is the Western Snowy Plover (Charadrius nivosus nivosus) (Foster 2006). This bird is protected under the Endangered Species Act and as such, disruption from dogs can lead to large fines for the owner and possible destruction of the dog if the same problem of harassing or harming of federally protected animals is a common occurrence. Dogs may also attack small mammals, amphibians, or reptiles which can be found in recreational parks and trails (National Park Service).

Organization:

Commenter: Faith Wall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 714 **Comment Id:** 353021 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The National Park Service should not allow dogs within or adjacent to areas considered critical habitat for endangered species. The NPS biologist and the restoration/natural resource specialist should provide information suitable to support such action. Please give wildlife in need the benefit of an unimpeded lifestyle.

Organization: Residential

Commenter: Ronald H Maykel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 714 **Comment Id:** 353022 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I specifically would like to see either alternative E or F used at Mori Point. 1.The sensitive nature of the Lishumsha Trail and it's proximity to critical habitat for the San Francisco Garter Snake and the Red Legged Frog should make it off limits to dog walking. The Mori Point Ridge Saddle is a corridor for frogs and snakes dispersing or migrating to and from the quarry and Calera Creek to the Northern Mori Point wetlands. To do so they must cross the Lishumsha Trail. 2.The Mori Point Ridge Timigtac trail is very narrow winding thru grassland habitat. User conflicts can occur hear with leashed dogs using it.

Organization: Residential

Commenter: Ronald H Maykel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 771 **Comment Id:** 353260 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I feel that there are many areas within our parks that should be completely off limits to dogs, particularly where endangered wildlife (nesting birds for example) can still be found.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1682 **Comment Id:** 353552 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The vast majority of the land area is not conveniently accessible to people because of the nature of the Coastal Scrub vegetation, and the abundance of poison oak! If people (and dogs) are limited to trails, they represent a relatively minor impact on the ecosystem as they will travel on only a small fraction of the total land area. The endangered species (i.e. checkered butterfly) live primarily in places where humans and dogs do not and will not be going.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 999 **Comment Id:** 354372 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: For the most part it seems like the wildlife is flourishing (coyotes, mountain lions, deer, bunnies, otters, hawks, certainly the gophers and moles..) Where endangered wildlife needs protecting we should do it, eg fencing around stream beds or nesting/feeding areas when dogs are allowed nearby. Re the Snowy Plovers - As I understand it only 4% o California's Snowy Plovers are in Marin and all of theses except one pair are safely protected at Pt Reyes and that this has been the case historically (in other words, the dogs have not chased them off).

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Cohn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2085 **Comment Id:** 355676 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I want to see and know just where are (The Site Specific Peer Review Studies) that were used to prove our Dogs are harming any Habitat for birds as well as the vegetation in the GGNRA??? The Snowy Plover is not endangered or on a Critical Habitat list that would justify the closing of Ocean Beach from Staircase 21 south two miles to Sloat Blvd. The law requires a Site Specific Peer Review to prove our Dogs are harming any Habitat for birds as well as the vegetation in the GGNRA, where is the proof?

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2170 **Comment Id:** 356092 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In my opinion the revised Dog Management Plan (issued Sept. 2013) does not find the appropriate balance for the portion of the GGNRA in Pacifica, an area with VERY many dog walkers and park land near many neighborhoods and therefore convenient for residents to walk their dogs on GGNRA property. How much should the "critical habitat" argument determine access by leashed dogs? I think the following point is critical. How much more environmental impact is there from a person walking with a leashed dog than from a person walking alone? I would contend for nearly all the trails the incremental difference is negligible,

especially on trails where the checkered butterfly is the relevant species of interest (i.e. Sweeney Ridge trails)

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2314 **Comment Id:** 357735 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There is no federally designated critical habitat in the GGNRA. Yet they cite possible impacts on critical habitat as a reason to ban dogs or restrict access to dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: wendy E Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3100 **Comment Id:** 357905 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS states that banning dogs at Ocean Beach will provide for "consistency with the Recovery Plan for the Western Snowy Plover." In spite of this claim, nowhere in the Recovery Plan does the USFWS suggest banning dogs on beaches that provide overwintering habitat. In fact, the recovery plan recommends leash restrictions to protect plovers, which is exactly what is currently in place at Ocean Beach. The NPS would be consistent with the recovery plan simply by enforcing the leash regulations that are currently in place.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357936 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Based on these studies that are either not specific to the area in question or >15 years out of date, the SEIS states that off-leash dogs "can" chase plovers and "could" harm them in the SPPA but provides no factual information to support that this actually happens in the SPPA. While this assertion is theoretically true, the on-the-ground information collected by the GGNRA but not described in the SEIS does not support the rationale that dogs in the SPPA in recent years, leashed or not, have a negative impact on the snowy plovers at this particular beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4592 **Comment Id:** 361089 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm a dog owner and I like to let my dog run off leash, but I also want to protect the environment and I believe endangered wildlife and habitats need to be protected from off-leash domestic dogs that scare birds and dig. I also have two young children and we like to hike in the National Parks. If we want to protect our parks and nature for future generations, we have to make some sacrifices and keep our pets at home. I support the Park Service's plan to limit

access to dogs in the parks in and surrounding San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Amy Gottesfeld **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4923 **Comment Id:** 361781 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a person that likes to watch wildlife, implementing more rules to help keep sensitive areas of GGNRA dog-free is very important. Areas with dogs on-leash has negative effects on wildlife as well but in such an urban area, I see the importance of compromising with the dog community if deemed compatible with the GGNRA mission and their responsibilities to plants and animals with special status.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5026 **Comment Id:** 362106 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Western Snowy Plover is a special status species whose habitat and individuals would be protected through restricted dog-access and other abatements, according to Alternative F (p. 272 of the Fall 2013 full text SEIS). These low-impact yet meaningful steps would be consistent with the recovery plan for the species, one of the many wildlife attractions for the millions of visitors to the area. They would also reinforce and sustain the GGNRAs ecological variety, which results from the synergy of its diverse species and habitats.

Organization:

Commenter: Aria Yow, MA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4224 **Comment Id:** 362230 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The statement on page 18 "Even though western snowy plovers do not nest at GGNRA" is going to make the public wonder why the snowy plover figures so prominently in the analysis given that over a long period of time only "... multiple instances where dogs flushed or chased shorebirds or snowy plovers at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field..."

Organization:

Commenter: G K Webb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362857 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Page 920 states that chronic disturbance of snowy plover at Ocean Beach during the nonbreeding season could indirectly affect breeding behavior of the species. Therefore, impacts would result in measurable and/or consequential changes in individuals of a species through frequent disturbance". The SEIS does not define "chronic disturbance" and the data does not reflect recent increases in plover populations. The old data from the 1990's should

be discarded. The newer data does not provide an example of anything that could be termed "chronic disturbance". The SEIS should define chronic disturbance for Ocean Beach plover and utilize recent data to defend the conclusion that it is occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362860 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not discuss the impacts occurring to the plover from the marked increase in raven populations, which predate on plover, at Ocean Beach. Ravens, a much larger bird that forage and scavenge closer to the surf, are more likely to be chased by dogs. The SEIS should document the indirect impact on plover predation by ravens and other predators if dogs are banned. Additionally, provide the scientific support that disturbance during the nonbreeding season is affecting breeding behavior. There is much unsupported conclusory statements in the SEIS regarding the impacts to the plover.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5385 **Comment Id:** 363034 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please consider the health and safety of threatened species when determining where dogs are allowed off leash. These species are in need of protection and the GGNRA is responsible for their safety as well as their ability to reproduce and live in peace. Please allow for clearly designated areas for off leash dogs so that everyone and every species can depend on the park for safety as well as recreation.

Organization:

Commenter: Lauren C Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5561 **Comment Id:** 363947 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Ocean beach is another area that is going to be affected. The current off-leash area is no where near the environmentally protected area of the plovers and the beach already is half zoned as on-leash so if the non dog owning public are afraid of animals they have plenty of space to be away from animals. With these two factors 1) no environmental impact and 2) no human impact, I see no reason to change the existing planning there.

Organization:

Commenter: john w earl **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5631 **Comment Id:** 364036 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Under Alternate F, the NPS preferred alternative for Muir Beach, is appropriate

for that site to protect the restored habitat at the mouth of Redwood Creek and several sensitive species. The Preferred Alternative in the Draft Supplemental EIS allows access for dogs on leash on the beach. MCL agrees with this approach, despite strong pressure from Muir Beach dog-owners to allow an unfenced ROLA on a portion of the beach. The large expanse of Rodeo Beach provides that opportunity.

Organization: Marin Conservation League

Commenter: Jon Elam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5648 **Comment Id:** 364069 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there is no way "voice control" can prevent dogs from trampling sensitive wildlife in the dune areas which may be critical nesting habitat for Western Snowy Plover, Least Tern and other special status species.

Organization:

Commenter: Liza Wozniak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4493 **Comment Id:** 365412 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have been visiting Oakwood Valley with my dogs for 16 years. Currently I am usually there on the weekends. Most of the people I meet walk their dogs off-leash. It is a very popular dog walking area. Your proposal contains no scientific proof that off-leash dog walking in Oakwood Valley has a detrimental impact on the livelihood of the spotted owl or the mission blue butterflies. Rather than changing the area to leash-only dog walking, can you post some signs in areas where the mission blue butterflies may be found?

Organization:

Commenter: Pavla Sim **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6101 **Comment Id:** 365418 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston is arguably the most popular place for dog walking and the plan to eliminate the vast majority of space for off-leash access and condense dogs into small areas is dangerous. There is no rationale and it could set up confrontations between dogs as well as people in small places. Furthermore, there is no justification for cutting off beach access between Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. Why would you want to do that? The plan cites two protected species at Fort Funston, the state threatened Bank Swallow (State) and the federally and state threatened San Francisco lessingia. However, there is no evidence that dogs or humans for that matter affect the swallow and the lessingia does not exist at Funston.

Organization:

Commenter: Dave Emanuel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365560 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Homestead Valley GGNRA preferred Alternative would allow on-leash dogs on the Homestead Fire Road and on future neighborhood connector trails that are yet to be established. We are concerned about approving additional "neighborhood connecting" trails without knowing their location, so that their impacts can be adequately evaluated. Further, MAS has a long-standing position in opposition to the development of new trails because there already are ample trails in Marin County and in GGNRA. We recommend that any new trail construction be accompanied by decommissioning of an existing trail of the same length in the same area. In particular, because Homestead Valley habitats support the endangered Spotted Owl, it is essential that any new trails, as well as all existing trails, be carefully evaluated to avoid habitat for this endangered species. In this sensitive habitat, at minimum all dogs should be required to be on-leash. The DSEIS speaks to actions that would benefit the Spotted Owl, but these are merely suggestions in the Marin County Plan for Homestead Valley. This plan was recently out for public review and, at that time, the plan discussed the presence of Spotted Owl but did not include protective policy recommendations or policies that even recognized endangered species. The DSEIS also mentions that the Barred Owl has more impact on the Spotted Owl than dogs. It is not a matter of "either-or". The impact analysis should consider the impacts of both dogs and Barred Owl cumulatively. Impacts from both sources increases the significance of the impacts of both.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365570 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Muir Beach The protective provisions of the previous preferred Alternative D, have been greatly modified, to allow dogs on the bridge, Muir Beach Trail and the beach. This site supports multiple endangered species including Red-legged Frog, Coho Salmon, Steelhead as well as shorebirds. This is also the location of a large habitat restoration project to benefit the endangered Red-legged Frog and other aquatic resources. The discussion on page 113 states that fencing would be installed to protect the dunes and lagoon, would serve as visual barrier and would enable the NPS to manage the area to protect the natural resources. It is acknowledged that the fences would only be visual barriers, and would not actually "protect resources as off leash dogs would still be able to access resources." In apparent conflict the discussion on page 862 states that the preferred alternative would "provide protection of the habitat at the lagoon and Redwood Creek...." It appears that the NPS is going out of their way to provide dog access in this sensitive location. We have little confidence that visitors will comply with leash regulations to ensure protection of the habitat and endangered species. The DSEIS acknowledges that the proposed fencing and leash provisions will not be effective in keeping dogs out of this sensitive habitat area. The preferred alternative might protect the visitor experience for dog walkers, but would do little to protect wildlife and habitat. Its success is based on assumed compliance which, as discussed above, is unrealistic and not supported by observations. No information is presented to change our minds that on-leashed dogs should be allowed only in the parking lot and picnic areas.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365571 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Marin Headlands Alternative F for this area was modified to expand on-leash dog-walking on the Rodeo Avenue and Morning Sun Trails, also on the Lower Rodeo Valley trail corridor, the North Lagoon Loop Trail, Old Bunker Fire Road and Batteries loop trail. Allowing dogs on perimeter trails only is intended to preserve the integrity of the interior habitat. The DSEIS reports that Mission Blue Butterfly habitat is not located along the roads/trails therefore impacts would be negligible.
Organization: Marin Audubon Society
Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366915 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The DMP would also preclude the possibility of the Snowy Plover or other shore birds from ever adopting many coastal areas of GGNRA as nesting areas. According to the background information printed in the Federal Register during a previous comment period pertaining to dogs on Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, "Snowy Plovers do not nest in the park; they overwinter from approximately July through April. During the overwintering period, Snowy Plovers rest and feed to gather reserves necessary to successfully breed at other more suitable nesting locations up and down the Pacific coast." Given that Snowy Plovers nest on the beaches of Point Reyes, I would assume that Snowy Plovers used to nest on the beaches of the San Francisco peninsula, beaches which are now part of GGNRA. Aside from disturbance by dogs and humans, are there any other factors that prevent Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, and other park coastal areas from being suitable nesting locations for Snowy Plovers and other shorebirds? If not, then the presence of dogs and humans in these areas during the nesting season is likely the reason why the Snowy Plover has to migrate to other locations. And, by allowing pets in these areas when Snowy Plovers would otherwise be nesting, this will surely prevent the plovers from ever selecting Crissy Field and/or Ocean Beach as a nesting site. And given how few suitable nesting sites are left for the Snowy Plover, it is incumbent upon the NPS-which is mandated to protect the wildlife unimpaired-to do everything it can to preserve whatever habitat there is for the plover to thrive. The NPS should therefore restrict dogs and other pets from potential nesting areas throughout the year.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366938 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Similarly, at Muir Beach, Alternative F would not provide the most protection to sensitive dune, riparian, and wetland habitats, nor to species such as the federally listed steelhead and coho salmon- -which will continue to suffer impacts resulting from dog waste and disturbance in shallow water areas- -nor wintering and migrant shorebirds. I also support

Alternative D at Muir Beach in order to provide visitors a no-dog beach experience

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366943 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Allowing the other trails in the Marin Headlands to remain open to dogs, as per Alternative F, would not maximize the protection of park resources nor maintain the integrity of the native plant communities and wildlife habitat, including habitat for the federally listed mission blue butterfly.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366950 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Similar to Rodeo Beach and Crissy Field, the NPS's preferred alternative for Ocean Beach once again, inexplicably, places a ROLA right next to a WPA, this one for Snowy Plovers. I am please to see that Alternative F would impose a year-round prohibition against dogs in the Snowy Plover Protection Area(SPPA), but having a ROLA immediately to the north of the SPPA is just an invitation for off-leash dogs to disturb the plovers. Please, at least adopt Alternative D for Ocean Beach. The on-leash designation at the north end of the beach would reduce the potential for conflict among visitors in the heavily used north end of the beach, closest to the parking lot, and would maximize protection for wintering and migratory shorebirds south of Sloat Boulevard.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366951 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Alternative F for Mori Point does not maximize the protection for newly restored, sensitive habitat and for the federally listed California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake. Please adopt Alternative D.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366952 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I urge the NPS to better protect the federally endangered mission blue butterfly, San Bruno elfin butterfly, San Francisco garter snake, and California red-legged frog and their habitats that exist at Milagra Ridge by adopting Alternative D, which would be more consistent with the park wide management of mission blue butterfly habitat areas than Alternative F

Organization:
Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6607 **Comment Id:** 367105 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am concerned that dogs off-leash could impact the endangered Tidewater Goby.
Organization:
Commenter: Rebecca Detrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6507 **Comment Id:** 367605 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In reading key parts of the 2013 SEIS, I see that there is little threat to the status of endangered species or landscapes due to people walking their dogs on trails in Marin County. I understand that there may need to be seasonal or temporary closure to trails for both humans and dogs due to special circumstances in limited areas. While it may be "easier" for the GGNRA to simply close dog access permanently to so many areas, it is not "easier" for the public they serve. I believe we all need to work together to achieve a balance of use, including dogs, on the trails that we have used historically.
Organization:
Commenter: Scott A Stender **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6507 **Comment Id:** 367613 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Similarly, I was told of one report of a Northern Spotted Owl heard only once recently in Oakwood Valley. As those birds are not disturbed much by humans and dogs, but more by habitat loss, I don't see a conflict with having spotted owls in the area. They are active mostly at night, and are generally found high enough in the trees as to not be effected by dogs. Yes, I could see the need for a temporary closure of a trail if a spotted owl happened to be nesting or fledging young in the area, much as we do for other sensitive species. It does not make sense to close this trail to dogs just because one spotted owl was heard one time. That bird could easily have been dispersing or passing through.
Organization:
Commenter: Scott A Stender **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367992 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This is unscientific and unfair. And it is disingenuous to roll out a list of every endangered or threatened species in the GGNRA, in order to slam off-leash exercise, which is presently permitted only in a minimal space and primarily in the most urbanized and heavily used areas of the GGNRA. Fort Funston, with Nike silos in the parking lot and gun batteries on

and fallen from the cliffs, is not pristine wilderness.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368123 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Ocean Beach: NO dogs off leashes must be allowed anywhere on this most crowded of all San Francisco beaches. As shown in current proposed maps, dogs are suggested to roam free right with families, tourists, and all manner of unsuspecting humans gather ' including the only parking lot designed to access this beach. This difficult bullet must be bitten, and although dog owners will scream and threaten, loose dogs on this entire beach cannot be tolerated ' we cannot duplicate the mistakes the SF Rec. & Park Dept. made in this regard: see Dolores Park where at least three-quarters of this crowded park is for dogs off-leashes with no barriers or signage to inform unsuspecting humans who are currently, as we speak, sitting where dogs have more right to be than people. Safety to the Snowy Plover must be given precedence to all other uses ' dog and human. There is no map which illustrates the need that all dogs be leashed on all of Ocean Beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have been told it is because of endangered species habitat and mixed use considerations. Despite the long history of off leash dog walking in the area, there is still habitat for a number of endangered species that no studies have been done to link off leash dog walking to negative impacts on any endangered species. In fact, the one creek in question that is within the boundaries of the off-leash area proposed by the MDG, there are more often children in the creek catching frogs and tadpoles. Unless you plan to prohibit or leash children too, perhaps education, barriers near crossing and/or proper signage would be a better alternative than shutting out users.

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 804 **Comment Id:** 368720 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Page 18 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement concerns endangered or nesting birds, particularly, plovers of the Genus Charadrius. The Statement notes off-leas dogs disturb snowy plovers, potentially reducing their chances of survival. I have a Master of Science degree in Biological Sciences from Stanford University, and although I concur with what was written, I fear this leaves out crucial information. I reside in the Park Merced apartment complex, and over the last year I have on three occasions seen coyotes there. I have walked my dog in Golden Gate Park and Glen Park

and have seen warnings of coyotes. From my observations, these three areas are not used as extensively for dog walking. In contrast, I have never seen a coyote, or seen a coyote warning sign, or seen a reference to coyotes in any of the regions of the GGNRA that are extensively used by dogs (such as Fort Funston or Crissy Field). From the perspective of a dog, some shore birds bear an unfortunate resemblance to the tennis balls they have been taught to fetch. However, from the standpoint of coyotes, snowy plovers look like dinner. Excluding dogs from regions of the park where they currently exist in large numbers might allow coyotes to take up residence, and such a scenario could be much more damaging to birds than the current state of affairs. Page 351 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement clearly states: Impacts can be either beneficial or adverse. I concur. I suggest that before dogs are removed or leashed in an area where they appear to thrive, and coyotes have not, further research on predation of shore birds, and the impact of relatively dense dog populations, as a counterbalance to predation by coyotes, should be considered. Moreover, The San Francisco Chronicle (http://www.sfgate.com/default/article/State-of-the-Birds-report-focuses-on-Bay-Area-2327006.php) reports The beach-loving bird called the western snowy plover and the bay-centric bird known as the California least tern, have seen population increases over the past few decades. Both are federally listed endangered species. It appears the current plan is serving well the interests of the snowy plover, and any change, including limiting dog access, should be viewed as a potential threat to the survival of this endangered species.

Organization:

Commenter: Dean G Kardassakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368793 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SEIS, pages 932-933, claims that allowing off-leash dogs to continue at Fort Funston would result in continued long-term minor adverse impacts on the bank swallow. GGNRA has been claiming for 15 years that the bank swallow colony at Fort Funston needs protection from people with dogs. Some of the bizarre counter-factual evidence offered in the DEIS has now been left out of the SEIS. Small progress toward reality. Still, there is no documented recreational disturbance to the bank swallow colony, only the repeated statements from the same thoroughly biased GGNRA staff. It has not happened that a dog has collapsed a burrow in the colony. An honest evaluation of Alternative A would say that no significant long term impacts on the bank swallow colony are likely. There are no adverse impacts occurring now, so it is not accurate to predict continued long-term adverse impacts.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369190 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many of the findings in the Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS are founded on a reference included in these documents as Appendix G, "Law Enforcement Data" (NPS 2008c). In the DEIS there was no tangible data. For example, an entry is as follows: "observed a black dog chasing a flock of 14 snowy plovers. I observed the dog chasing the birds from the water to the dunes and up and down the beach for several hundred meters north and south. The dog would charge at the

birds and the Plovers would fly away from the dog. Each time the Plovers would attempt to land, the dog would charge directly at them and cause them to take flight again. I watched this happen for continually for eight minutes timed by my watch from 1150 to 1158 hours. Then the dog stopped chasing the Plovers and wandered in the hilly dunes to the north/or several minutes. The dog then returned to chasing the Snowy Plovers for a few minutes more... After the dog ceased chasing the Plovers, they stopped taking flight and started feeding at the water line." Clearly, if this dog was chasing plovers, they would not have returned to feeding at the water line after the chase was over. Plovers feed at the high tide line when the water has already retreated. These were sanderlings, birds that appear almost identical to the plover, are plentiful at Ocean Beach (not threatened or endangered) and can be differentiated by different feeding patterns and different resting patterns. However, in the Appendix G for the SEIS, we have a plethora of graphs outlining the number of violations by area of the GGNRA and year. However, because we have no idea about the level of visitation at each area, there is no context. For 2001-2006, they merely show the number of violations within all of the GGNRA per year. We can see that for 2006, there are 3943 violations, and dog related violations are about 6% of the total. The information we really need, and the GGNRA fails to provide, is that dogs were involved in approximately 227 violations when 13.5 million visitors (many with dogs) came to the GGNRA in 2006. Does this level of infractions justify a decision at that time to radically change the Dog Management policy?

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369320 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The requisite monitoring of the plover (as dictated by NPS regulations) in the GGNRA has not been completed in a manner that would provide scientific proof of a need for restrictions. In fact, even the GGNRA admitted in 1996 that the "scientific evidence" showed that restriction of off-leash recreation will not increase the number of plovers at Ocean Beach. It is more likely that the restriction of off-leash recreation in these areas will negatively impact the plover population. Studies in other areas fail to substantiate the GGNRA's plan to limit access in the GGNRA to benefit the plover. Monitoring in areas like Surf Beach at Vandenburg AFB has confirmed there was an increase in plover breeding pairs and viability before restrictions were instituted. In 2011, it was confirmed there has been no increase in breeding pairs since 1995 when restrictions were instituted, and only 39% of the fledglings survived due to predation. It is generally presumed the presence of dogs and humans discourages the presence of predators such as the fox.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369321 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Recovery Plan states that the Western Snowy Plover does not nest or breed at the Ocean Beach location. The Draft Recovery Plan also indicates that despite implementation of best management practices, this location (Ocean Beach) holds NO promise for the plover to

nest or breed there in the future. (Table B-1, p. B-11.) Conversations with Gary Page of the Point Reyes Bird Observatory (a central contributor to the USFWS Draft Recovery Plan) reveal that this conclusion was drawn primarily because the level of human activity is too high on some California beaches to ever support a breeding population of the plover. This is consistent with the conclusions of a UK study (specifically identified in the new studies section of this comment) which states, "Sites that are highly disturbed are not used by breeding birds, and therefore any increase in disturbance levels on these sites will not alter population size". Thus, the state of the evidence is that the survival/extinction of the Western Snowy Plover population will not be impacted by the management of Ocean Beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369322 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Further, Daphne Hatch's 1996 study for the GGNRA documented that since the off-leash policy was officially sanctioned in 1979, there has been an increase of more than 100 percent in the number of snowy plovers frequenting Ocean Beach. Even dog "rush hours" don't seem to faze the plovers- at least, GGNRA observers and analysts couldn't find any negative relationship between the number of dogs on the beach at any given time and the number of plovers on the beach at the same time (pg. 10, 13). Faced with this evidence, GGNRA officials twice acknowledged, at a December 16, 1996 "informational meeting" for San Francisco beachgoers, that banning off-leash recreation or banning dogs entirely at Ocean Beach would have NO effect on the number of plovers on Ocean Beach. Despite this finding, the 2006 Hatch report, the DEIS and SEIS still recommend the restriction of off-leash recreation at Ocean Beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369327 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We believe that it is mischaracterizing the problem to attribute the "disturbance" of the plover exclusively (or even significantly) to off-leash dogs. The data do not support this conclusion. It follows, therefore, that addressing off-leash dogs only will not effectively protect the plover. We maintain, based upon the data, that proper protection of the plover would encompass the effect of humans, predators, and other wildlife as well.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369396 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In actuality, because it is acknowledged by the GGNRA that removal of off-leash dogs or banning will not increase the number of plovers at Ocean Beach, the question becomes, will the restriction of dogs decrease the number of plovers at Ocean Beach? There is

evidence to confirm this is probable, as a similar scenario which involved the Bank Swallow has already occurred in the GGNRA- - in an area directly adjacent to Ocean Beach, i.e., Fort Funston.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6570 **Comment Id:** 369570 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The National Park Service should protect these and other native species for future generations. One example of a federally listed species found within the park is the Snowy Plover. The US Fish and Wildlife Service Recovery Plan for the Snowy Plover states Pets should be prohibited on beaches and other western snowy plover habitats if, based on observations and experience, pet owners fail to keep pets leashed and under full control. The sensitive habitat for the Snowy Plover today is clearly ignored by some irresponsible dog owners. The compliance with the leash rules is weak. In 2008-2009 compliance was 34% and about 40% since that time. See http://www.goldengateaudubon.org/wp-content/uploads/10819-GGA-Crissy-Field-WPA-SNPL-Report-2009-2010-finalRepï¿½2f0Q_20 10-final11.pdf

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369645 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE SEIS DOES NOT ADEQUATELY CONSIDER HOW THE PRESENCE OF DOGS MAY BENEFIT SNOWY PLOVERS AND BANK SWALLOWS The SETS assumes dogs have only negative impacts on snowy plovers, primarily by chasing them or flushing the birds if a dog runs nearby. However, there may be benefits to having dogs around that the SEIS does not consider. In a January 31, 2014 letter to the editor in the San Francisco Chronicle, Tom Lurtz, from McKinleyville, writes: Controlling crows and ravens that prey on the nests could be as important as monitoring people and dogs. The state has been working for years to help snowy plovers breed on Clam Beach in Humboldt County. Unfortunately, the intelligent ravens and crows have learned to recognize areas that have been fenced to protect the nest sites from dogs and humans. In the April 2011 edition of the West Portal Monthly, Dan Murphy, a local plover counter and expert from the Golden Gate Chapter of the Audubon Society, is quoted as saying: Ocean Beach isnt really suitable for nesting [of plovers]. Not only is it overrun with people and dogs, its loaded with predators. He continues, There are typically between 15 and maybe 40 ravens in the plover protection area at any given time. There are additional birds that come and go during the day. Then there are the other predators that use the beach, mostly at night. In other words, there are way too many predators and disturbances to suggest Ocean Beach is a likely spot for successful plover nesting. Finally in the December 2013 edition of the West Portal Monthly, Dan Murphy is quoted as saying: Birds and birding are endlessly interesting. Watching ravens teach their young to hunt the rare Bank Swallows at Fort Funston was mind-blowing. There is no evidence that dogs have ever injured or killed a snowy plover or bank swallow. Clearly natural predators, and in particular ravens and crows, present the real dangers to snowy plovers and bank swallows in the GGNRA. The presence of dogs may

keep ravens and crows away from the plovers and bank swallows, protecting them from their real enemies. This interaction should be studied and included in the SETS. Because it was not, the SETS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/04/2014)

TE5000 Threatened And Endangered Species: Cumulative Impacts (Substantive)

1. Commenters noted that it was unclear how the cumulative projects for the Mission blue butterfly would help mitigation impacts from dog use in the GGNRA.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 376544 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Various actions are mentioned to benefit Mission Blue Butterfly: protecting habitat outside the Headlands and Fort Baker; several past projects, and "Additional acreage of mission blue butterfly habitat that will be restored under an agreement with the USFWS." The success of the two completed projects (1984 and 2007) is not stated, nor is it clear how they would offset or render negligible impacts from dog use. They could simply be providing more habitat for dogs to impact. Also, it is not clear what additional acreage would be restored, where and when, and whether or how these projects would minimize of offset impacts from continued and increased dog use. It is not demonstrated that the projects described would offset or mitigation the impacts of dogs on the species, but at least the impacts would largely be confined to the perimeter.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/08/2014)

VR2010 Vegetation and Riparian Areas: Affected Environment (Substantive)

1. **Commenters noted that areas within the GGNRA where dogs are allowed currently often are composed of areas of non-native or invasive vegetation, and are not impacted by dog use. Some commenters noted that plants are already adapted to dog use, and felt that if dogs were damaging vegetation it would be more apparent.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 252 **Comment Id:** 350357 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Fort Funston is, and has been the pre eminent dog exercise area in the Bay Area. The dominant plant species there is Iceplant, and the dominant soil there is sand. The wildlife is birds, and none of these three is damaged or disturbed by off leash dog activities.

Organization:

Commenter: Ronald L Giuntini **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1035 **Comment Id:** 351460 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I understand that part of the concern is the impact on flora and fauna at the park. There are many areas in the park that are marked off for multiple reasons and access is blocked off. My experience has been that people are respectful of those boundaries.I suspect that the flora and fauna are doing just fine in those areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Arthur Storey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1643 **Comment Id:** 353242 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have been around Funston for years. I just don't see dogs ruining the greenery like some suggest as an ecological concern.

Organization:

Commenter: Female Dog Owner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1689 **Comment Id:** 353631 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In Marin County, different rules - a different philosophy - should apply; off-leash dogs are extremely unlikely to pose a substantive threat to the plants or animals which are already adapted both to a) the presence of dogs in the environment, and b) the relatively harsh conditions which exist specifically because the surrounding environment is a harsh one.

Organization:

Commenter: David E Gurley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2820 **Comment Id:** 357556 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs have been in the GGNRA - well - basically forever! But wildlife, plants, wild animals flourish in the park, if dogs were causing irreparable damage to the wilderness aspects of the park, would we not have seen effects by now?
Organization:
Commenter: Claus Schlund **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5727 **Comment Id:** 364190 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I was particularly suprised to hear about some of these access-threatened locations, because there is very little wildlife in them to protect. Crissy field is a lawn, not wilderness. Fort Funston and Ocean Beach have no plant life. These restrictions feel very arbitrary in the public eye and do not seem to serve the greater good.
Organization:
Commenter: Beth L **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

2. Many commenters recounted experiences of dogs impacting vegetation, or noted that dogs have degraded natural areas of the GGNRA.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 685 **Comment Id:** 352942 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am a volunteer with the Golden Gate Parks and work both at Crissy Field and in the Crissy Wildife Protection Area (WPA). I've seen firsthand the problems of bad dog owners (the dogs are fine, it's the people, of course!) letting their dogs harass wildlife, tear up the ground, transmit invasive plant seeds and bother people.
Organization:
Commenter: Cornelia Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 796 **Comment Id:** 353304 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As wildflower photographers we see the effects of so many dogs on special wildflower areas and the plant life where these large numbers of dogs are allowed to run off leash off trail in GGNRA on daily basis. It seems that individual dog owners don't always see the cumulative effect of so many dogs in the Bay Area.
Organization:
Commenter: Nita M Winter **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 878 **Comment Id:** 353544 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Some dog owners are responsible for cleaning up their dog feces while others are not. The urine that dogs produce cannot be removed and produces foul odors that accumulate during the dry season. I believe that the buildup of nitrogenous wastes from dogs is harmful to the soil and the plants that grow within the GGNR. A number of these plants and the animals that depend on them are endemic to the area.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3332 **Comment Id:** 358159 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sasha was always on a leash. That dog would obey every command I gave her, and would come when called, but I always left her on leash because the wildlife in the GGNRA was more important. In Sasha's later years we avoided Fort Funston; off-leash dogs have spoiled what was once a beautiful dunes habitat. Off-leash dogs are a menace at Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and a dozen other locations - - none of which I have been comfortable bringing my children to. Please treat our parks, or lands, our flora and our fauna, and yes please treat our dogs, with respect, and ban all off-leash dogs in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Thomas J McCarthy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5137 **Comment Id:** 362265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I watched over the course of a few years as more and more dogs trampled that huge coffeeberry into oblivion. The Park Service stood by and did nothing to save the plant or even to collect berries so the gene pool of that remarkable plant could be preserved. Too late now. Not only is that plant gone, so too are most of the shrubs that provided habitat around the Y grove, Battery Davis and the Skyline grove. The smaller shrubs were stomped down, the larger ones seem to have succumbed to the constant flow of dog urine inflicted upon them. The ground dwelling animals are gone too. Jackrabbits, California Quail and Spotted Towhees are all gone. It is likely they were chased to the point they could no longer reproduce, so either left for other places or just lived out their lives until their species were extirpated. I do not know the fate of the brush rabbits, but I haven't seen any in many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan and Dan Murphy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5476 **Comment Id:** 363340 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When I go to Fort Funston and see the denuded landscape north of the parking lot due to off leash dog activity, I have to wonder how the National Park Service is meeting it's legal requirement All one has to do is look at the southeast corner of the site to see what the

landscape should look like since few dogs run free in that area.
Organization:
Commenter: James P Kren **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 101 **Comment Id:** 339937 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Domesticated invasive animals pose a threat to the natural atmosphere, and the flora and fauna that have been manicured and have naturally sprung up out of Golden Gate Park since its inception.

Organization:

Commenter: Hale N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1129 **Comment Id:** 351687 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The trails are the ideal place for walking dogs, and the majority of dogs on the GGNRA trails stay on the trails, do not adversely effect the vegetation or environment, are friendly, and are enjoyed by the majority of trail users.

Organization:

Commenter: Hope Timberlake **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1400 **Comment Id:** 352447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is rarely the case when I don't see off leash dogs running through the new plantings, damaging the work to preserve habitat for endangered species. I have been afraid several times for my safety and that of my son because of pitbull and similar breeds off-leash, as well as other large dogs chasing wildly through the area with their owners far from any ability to curb and control their dogs. I realize there are a number of respectful dog owners, but it only takes one neglectful owner to precipitate a tragedy.

Organization:

Commenter: Summer Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 624 **Comment Id:** 352759 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have seen the damage dogs off leash can do to the beach,native plant areas, and bird resting,nesting and feeding.

Organization: California Native Plant Society

Commenter: Jean Conner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1833 **Comment Id:** 354292 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mostly, dogs run along the waterline leaving the rest of the beach alone. There is no flora growing at the water's edge on a sandy beach. Sensitive areas on the way to the beach are protected by enforceable dog leash laws. Similarly, the water's edge is not a sensitive wildlife habitat. The footprint of dogs is far smaller than the footprint of humans. There have been few

documented incidents of dog damage to the environment.(e.g. I have never seen a dog with a Snowy Plover in its mouth).

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 1836 **Comment Id:** 354313 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not once have I seen a mishap created by a dog, nor have I noticed the dogs seriously destroying the habitat. In fact, over the years having surfed at Ocean Beach, I have see the coastline and dunes drastically change as result of storms or high surf.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen Nichols **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1856 **Comment Id:** 354380 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a neighbor and volunteer at the Presidio, I frequently encounter dog walkers with dogs off leash. Many times the dogs are running in areas that are clearly marked as sensitive habitat. Although I am a dog lover, I still believe that there must be strict rules to manage dogs in the Presidio. No dog should be off leash in sensitive areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean Colvin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3280 **Comment Id:** 358038 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The dog situation is out of control here in Marin County. Our trails are filling up with dog feces that are left behind by owners that unleash their dogs in "leash only" areas and look the other way. I love dogs and feel that there are many responsible dog owners out there, but the many irresponsible dog owners are allowing their dogs to run up and down the hillsides here tearing up the natural terrain.

Organization:

Commenter: Sandy g Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3334 **Comment Id:** 358170 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I often go birding in golden Gate Park, the Presidio, Ocean Beach, El Polin Springs, and Glen Park Canyon. In all of these places I see dogs running through wildlife habitat chasing birds and trammeling native plants and shrubs and owners willfully letting them.

Organization: JeepNey Projects Worldwide

Commenter: David Tomb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361561 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sweeney Ridge I prefer option 19A with the addition of all of the Baquiano trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica to its conclusion at the Portola Discovery site. I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dog walking given the historical use of area (once an active military site, 4x4 vehicle trails, gas/water/electricity rights of ways, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation. "No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing. "Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. "Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361562 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston: I prefer option 16A over any other. I do not prefer options 16B,C, D, E, or F for the following reasons: "Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Funston trail systems. "Over stating of damage caused by dog usage given the historical use of area (once an active military site, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation. "No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing. "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural, open park setting. "Fort Funston is nationally-recognized as on of the greatest dog parks in the country. This kind of open space is not available anywhere else in the greater bay area. "Is enforcement realistic? It would seem by virtue of the vast, interconnecting trail system, the GGNRA would have to resort to excessive enforcement measures to regulate the trail use. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking. "Fort Funston has no real appeal to any other user group due to its cliffs, steep terrain, and climate. It is my opinion that restricting dog use will not invite the perceived low-impact user(hikers), rather it will invite an element of transients, loiters, and trespassers. The dog users are both the stewards and proprietors of this land; the presence of such unwanted elements is diverted by virtue of the presence of dog enthusiasts among others.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4983 **Comment Id:** 361890 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The presence of large numbers of hyperactive dogs is damaging to these resources. They harass birds and trample plants. They interfere with other people's pleasure, making some areas unusable for large numbers of people.

Organization: California Native Plant Society Yerba Buena Chapter

Commenter: Jake Sigg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5618 **Comment Id:** 364015 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: At Fort Funston, which is overrun with non-native invasive plant species, I don't see how off leash impacts the native environment. In the areas that are sensitive, where the fence line is in tatters, I could see greater enforcement to reduce impact.

Organization:

Commenter: Kevin F Cubba **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5885 **Comment Id:** 364461 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Aside from harrasing humans and leashed dogs, I have observed uncontrolled pets chasing birds, running through and pooping in naturaly sensitive areas, digging for gophers and voles in erosion vunnerable trail banks, attacking ducks at El Polin, and herons, seagulls, and numerous shorebirds at Crissy field as well as on the beaches. I once saw a large dog get dangerously close to a great blue heron at Ft Scott, ending the magnificent bird's patient and graceful hunt for a meal.

Organization:

Commenter: andrew morrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6055 **Comment Id:** 365265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have watched countless moments when handicapped people, children, other pets, as well as birds, are frightened by roving off-leash dogs. I also watch the degradation of the ground and ground cover by uncontrolled dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Eugenie Marek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6176 **Comment Id:** 365755 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E) I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to: Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the new Devils Slide Trail. Over stating of damage caused

by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species. San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation. Consideration for ADA accessibility. Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting. San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable. Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement. Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily E Read **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6648 **Comment Id:** 368220 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This includes enforcing laws banning dogs from certain areas of the park. In my 7 years as an HRT volunteer in the Marin Headlands, I have seen, first hand, how the increasing number of illegal dogs, even on a leash can harm natural habitat, jumping at quail, relieving themselves on native plants, and barking at visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim Morrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/09/2014)

VR4000 Vegetation And Riparian Areas: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives (Substantive)

1. **Commenters felt the impacts on vegetation from dogs stated in the SEIS are small, particularly in light of other factors, such as human impacts, and that impacts were not well studied or quantified. Commenters felt the mention of poison oak as a species for protection from dogs was not appropriate given its negative impact on humans and dogs.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 360 **Comment Id:** 351144 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Im stunned that the SEIS makes a dramatic case about habitat destruction and the environmental impact of dogs within these parks, but fails to quantify that their impact is an extremely minor rounding error vs. other factors (including human impact) that are many ordersof- magnitude more significant.

Organization:

Commenter: Glenn Hout **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2567 **Comment Id:** 359098 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I also note in the latest draft of the plan that there are citations to publications that support the general theory that dogs can harm vegetation, yet I did not see an indication that the actual adverse impact of dogs off-leash in these specific parks has been quantified. This is disappointing since it seems to be used as a basis for action throughout much of the document.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel Gould **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4215 **Comment Id:** 362219 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I read the section of the report that discusses the impact of dogs on vegetation, which is offered as part of the explanation for reducing the number of areas where dogs would be allowed off leash. The section on page 15 of the introduction to the report relies on a number of old studies (dating to 1935), which state that breaking branches and bending limbs can be harmful to vegetation. I understand that off-leash dogs might cause such damage to vegetation, but the same would be true for deer, coyotes, and other large mammals. I know of other research that actually cites the beneficial effects of such interactions between large mammals and the surrounding vegetation. To me, the most disappointing aspect of this section is that it makes no mention of the fact that the overwhelming majority of off-leash dog use in the GGNRA is on grown lawns and on beaches, where none of the cited problems can occur. The evidence offered

does not in any way prove that a change in policy will reduce the number of broken branches in the GGNRA. By citing these studies in the way this report cites them, the NPS seems to be reaching far outside of any known impact of dogs in the GGNRA in order to make a case for very broad restrictions. I would prefer that the NPS rely on arguments that make a connection between the actual effects of dogs in the GGNRA and the policy recommendations.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5584 **Comment Id:** 363966 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I take issue with a park plan for an urban park adjacent to a large population to put protection of poison oak (toxicodendron is its name) as a value above the people of the area. There is probably no human who would not have a negative reaction to this plant. It therefore is a danger for humans. For a plan to want to protect this toxic plant in this busy area of recreation for so many people is unconscionable. This plan reeks of a value system that needs revisiting. It seems the "native plant society" has too much control over this plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Claire Mills **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4371 **Comment Id:** 364122 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The 2013 Environmental Impact Statement appears to be biased against dogs. Studies which have found minimal impact from dogs have been suppressed. For example, in the GGNRA's own Draft Dog Management Plan/EIS of January 2011, it cites a study by Bekoff, M., and C.A. Meaney, saying "off-leash dogs generally travelled less than 6 to 15 feet off trail, for less than 1 to 2 minutes. They further noted that dogs traveling farther off trail were often lured there by the people responsible for them (throwing sticks, balls, or Frisbees, or going off trail and calling their dogs to follow)." The same study found that "off leash dogs generally did not travel far off-trail and rarely were observed to chase other dogs, disturb people, chase wildlife, destroy vegetation or enter bodies of water." This study by Bekoff and Meaney is nowhere to be found in the 2013 DGMP/Supplemental EIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Lou Shapiro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368783 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Soils and Vegetation SEIS spends a lot of space making the case that dogs damage soils and vegetation. Nowhere does SEIS attempt to quantify that damage, though they acknowledge that there are many other forces that alter soils and vegetation within the GGNRA. So, even though there is no evidence that the effect of dogs in the GGNRA is significant, SEIS devotes considerable pseudo-scientific effort to prove the effect exists. Discussed as follows: 2. SEIS, page 374, uses Shulzitski and Russell 2004 to say, heavy off-leash dog use increases

deterioration of native plant communities. Shulzitsky said this in his prestudy introduction to the unpublished version of the paper. He offered no evidence because he didnt study dogs or their impact on plant communities. Shulzitski 2004 is simply not a scientific citation about dogs and plant communities. Note that Shulzitski did not make the claim in the version of his paper submitted to a peer reviewed journal (Ecological Restoration Vol. 27, No. 4, 2009.) I conclude that he gave GGNRA what GGNRA wanted with this off-hand remark, but declined to make a statement to scientific peers for which he had no evidence.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Some commenters noted that in many areas natural factors would prevent dogs from leaving trail areas, resulting in almost no impacts on vegetation, or that the impacts stated in the SEIS were overblown as dogs are largely found in areas with non-native vegetation.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 435 **Comment Id:** 351365 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Comments specific to Pedro Point Headlands: Additionally, the vegetation is very dense on this site so it is almost impossible for dogs to wander off trail if not on leash (which they would be)on all the proposed trails thus they would have virtually no impact on vegetation and would have no access to the restoration areas which are very steep areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Samuel Casillas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1787 **Comment Id:** 353856 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Being a Geologist (I know some information about environmental issues) there is no reason that the dogs should not be allowed. I understand that dogs trample the vegetation, however, if were talking about the amount of area the dogs trample versus the entire area of the parks their destruction of vegetation is almost negligible. Our government has already ruined the natural vegetation by planting the non-native ice plant and the Pampas grasses thinking it would prevent erosion.

Organization:

Commenter: Michele Batista **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Commenters were concerned about the impacts of dogs and dog waste on vegetation and invasive species introduction in the GGNRA. Some commenters noted that they would prefer to see no dogs in areas with fragile vegetation.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 192 **Comment Id:** 350076 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I use the fire road on a weekly basis and STRONGLY BELIEVE THE DOGS

NEED TO BE ON LEASH OR BANNED ALTOGETHER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: Dog walkers routinely walk 4 dogs who are rarely on leash. I see these dogs run wild disturbing hikers, families, bike riders, local wildlife (Rabbits,birds, etc.), digging/crush native vegetation, and defecating on the trail.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1245 **Comment Id:** 352057 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I worry about the environmental impact of poop on the trails and how those dogs affect other wildlife and plants in the area.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Evans **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 663 **Comment Id:** 352856 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Plants can also become affected by the presence of unmanaged dogs. Dog fur can carry seeds for great distances. This can bring in invasive species. When travelling with a dog across state lines, no one thinks to brush the animal for seeds. Keeping the dog in certain areas and controlled by the owner lowers the risk of the spread of invasive plants (Parks and Rec. of Oregon). Also, dogs cause excessive damage to the top soil and plants with behavioral digging or running. Sensitive plants and plants with shallow roots may become uprooted due to this form of damage.

Organization:

Commenter: Faith Wall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5631 **Comment Id:** 364035 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We are fully aware of the potential for adverse effects of large numbers of dogs caused by trampling vegetation, depositing dog waste, and adding nutrients. Such degradation of high quality habitat can result in displacing wildlife from preferred habitats, with eventual loss of species from the area. For each of the seven sites in Marin, the Draft SEIS identifies sensitive species, habitats, and/or cultural resources that may be threatened by dogs and has recommended an appropriate response. Therefore, where a choice must be made between allowing dog access and protecting native wildlife, endangered species or sensitive vegetation, the Draft SEIS tips the balance toward protecting the resource.

Organization: Marin Conservation League

Commenter: Jon Elam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6217 **Comment Id:** 366134 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A worthy undertaking, to try to manage the already excessive population in beaches and parks. They represent, by their numbers, a large and negative impact on plants and birds and non-dog toting humans.

Organization:

Commenter: Rosemary Ranck **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. **Some commenters expressed concern that overcrowding dogs in smaller off-leash areas would cause a greater impact to vegetation in these areas. Another commenter stated that not providing enough off-leash dog access in the plan would result in non-compliance by dog owners, who would impact more habitat as they spread out.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1562 **Comment Id:** 353104 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There needs to be a few places to allow dogs off leash. If it is not provided then owners will still let dogs off leash, but spread out over many natural lands and impacting more habitat.

Organization:

Commenter: eileen jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 988 **Comment Id:** 354360 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have walked my dog at Crissy Field for 9 years and think most dog walkers are responsible and considerate of the environment and fellow park users. I think the further reduction in designated dog access areas proposed in other options including the preferred Option F could result in overcrowding of dogs in designated areas and thus could possibly cause more impact to vegetation in those areas.

Organization: San Francisco Resident and Crissy Field Dog Group

Commenter: Laura Blake **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2727 **Comment Id:** 357144 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have seen in Marin that the fewer areas allowed for off-leash dog walking, the more impacted those areas become, the more the complaints, and the cycle increases speed.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheri T Joseph **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6121 **Comment Id:** 365479 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If nothing else, give us more of Fort Funston for off-leash use. Reducing the available off-leash areas as much as you propose will mean more dogs in a smaller space, putting greater stress on the existing vegetation and soil, and likely producing an increase in dog feces

per square foot. Most of us clean up, but not everyone does or will - with more dogs in less space, it won't be pretty.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate Hellenga **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 349887 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We favor maximum restrictions on where dogs are allowed. Their effect on wildlife and flora can't be positive.

Organization: Evogeneao

Commenter: Len Eisenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 316 **Comment Id:** 350570 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Restoration of native plants, wilderness experience are all great concepts, but they do not work in a densely populated area. restoration of habitat and native plants can be done on other stretches of the coast.

Organization:

Commenter: Fabienne Blanc **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 608 **Comment Id:** 352716 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to see "no dogs" in fragile areas, such as beaches and wildlife nesting areas, and restored planting areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Bette-B Bauer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1682 **Comment Id:** 353552 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The vast majority of the land area is not conveniently accessible to people because of the nature of the Coastal Scrub vegetation, and the abundance of poison oak! If people (and dogs) are limited to trails, they represent a relatively minor impact on the ecosystem as they will travel on only a small fraction of the total land area. The endangered species (i.e. checkered butterfly) live primarily in places where humans and dogs do not and will not be going.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1959 **Comment Id:** 354617 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The benefit to the Bay Area's natural plant/animal life by restricting dogs to leashes in these spaces seems very suspect to me considering the fact that these spaces represent a small percentage of the natural land of the Bay area, and that they are spaces already altered by the humans and human infrastructure that surround them.

Organization:
Commenter: Sabrina Barry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2210 **Comment Id:** 356797 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I write in support of the proposed new rules and stricter policies for dogs in the GGNRA. GGNRA is the only national park that allows unleashed dogs, which has a negative impact on wildlife, plant life, and other patrons in the park. I say this as a dog owner and someone who has worked and volunteered in animals shelters for many years. But I am also a birder, and an environmentalist, and I don't believe that the narrow interests of dog owners should be allowed to trump all other considerations.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephanie L Strait **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357939 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: "Vegetation and Soils: The SEIS indicates no impacts except minor for coastal communities under the current policy. This assumes a benefit from compliance from a no dog policy. Using common compliance assumptions for a no-dog policy and a leashed-dog policy would likely result in no difference in benefit between these two options.
Organization:
Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2385 **Comment Id:** 358861 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Not a single resident plant or animal benefits from the presence of dogs in the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Patrick Skain **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3994 **Comment Id:** 360393 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs destroying vegetation? From all appearances the non-native eucalyptus and ice plant are doing just fine.
Organization:
Commenter: Bjorn Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4785 **Comment Id:** 361526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Of course there are other voices that support a different position than mine, but

the "scientific" and real evidence of the impact of dogs in the GGNRA just doesn't hold up. In the 22 years that I have used the GGNRA spaces with my dogs, the wild flora and fauna of the parklands has thrived. WIth proper signage and enforcement by the National Park Service, conflicts can be minimized.

Organization:

Commenter: Laurie Berk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4224 **Comment Id:** 362227 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a wildlife researcher at San Jose State, I have been disappointed to see how this SEIS has promoted skepticism for Federal Management of wildlife resources. I pointed out in the first round of comments that many of the conclusions of the SEIS with regard to negative impacts of dogs did not follow from the contradictory scientific literature cited in the analysis. Perhaps the GGNRA feels that the public will not read or cannot follow this information. Summaries of this literature, particularly in the section on Dogs and Natural Resources, are not balanced or objective. Little effort has been made to investigate any of these issues for the sites under consideration, although clearly there would have been public support for data collection. For example from page 34, "It has been documented that recreational activities can affect vegetation and soils,resulting in damage to plant communities (Cole 1978, 281; Douglass et al. 1999, 9.2)." All species in their normal behavior affect vegetation and soils. Where are the specifics? This document lacks the balance and attention to measured impacts that we expect in a formal SEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: G K Webb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4243 **Comment Id:** 362315 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have a strong interest in the vegetation that occurs in the Presidio part of the GGNRA, and am particularly interested in the overwhelming presence of the Eucalyptus trees that seem to be growing out of control. I ran across the plan for the GGNRA and particularly the section which indicates that pets can be a source of "exotic plant seeds". I noticed that this section suggests that reducing or eliminating dogs from the GGNRA could reduce the appearance of non-native plant species. Unfortunately, this section makes this claim without showing any evidence that any such species have ever arisen from dog feces anywhere in the national parks. Isn't it well-knowen that Birds are most common means of transportation for seeds? The report provides no direct evidence at all that elimination of dogs from trails in the GGNRA would impact this issue. I was surprised to see these sections, which claim to be presenting a scientific case for a change in policy, but which are only making unsupported claims about the impact of dogs on the parks. If the NPS regards the introduction of non-native species as a high priority, I would prefer to see proposals for policy changes in the GGNRA that could have an impact on this problem. I am disappointed to see the NPS misusing the problem of non-native species as an "scientific" argument for a change in dog-walking policy.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5227 **Comment Id:** 362714 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Over the 2008-2011 period, the NPS recorded a total of three incidents of dogs damaging vegetation and fifteen incidents of dogs disturbing wildlife. These numbers are recorded in a period of over 40,000,000 visitors to the GGNRA, again hardly indicative of an issue.
Organization:
Commenter: David Nielsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5589 **Comment Id:** 363975 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have not noticed dogs going into the fenced off areas where seeding and native plants are being grown. The dogs stay with their people and other dogs. I have much more often seen children playing in those areas picking flowers and plants. So it might be more effective to ban children. I don't see how you can justify not allowing dogs at Chrissy field, they are much less likely to impact anything than the wind and kite surfers who occasionally take over the whole beach. Yet there is no talk of banning them.
Organization:
Commenter: Ted Helminski **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4487 **Comment Id:** 365388 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: This new dog plan for Rancho Coral de Tierra will very negatively affect my dog and I. I have grown up in Montara and I have been using Rancho for walking my dog many years here. In reading over this document I have found it very unconvincing. There is little to no evidence of dogs destroying or hurting the vegetation or wildlife in Rancho Corral de Tierra. If I am to accept that claim that off-leash dog walking is causing damage then I need scientific proof. If you can reference any hard evidence of the ecological impact then please let me know.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeremy A MacKinnon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365506 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: the Natural resources objective is to reduce the detrimental effects of dogs on wildlife and natural vegetation. However, throughout the report, I find no evidence that shows that the present policies have produced any particular detrimental effects. There are many hypothetical statements, and plausible observations, but the plain truth is that the overwhelming majority of off-leash dog use in the GGNRA is on beaches or on planted lawn areas, where none of the detrimental effects are even possible.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368784 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SEIS, page 426, cites Shulzitski again to claim that dogs damage soils and vegetation in the restored areas at Fort Funston: on many occasions, dogs and humans were observed inside this area. What Shulzitski actually said in the published version of his paper is, though a small number of visitors and their pets continued to use the restricted areas, the measures [post-and-cable fencing] were successful for the most part. Please note the large difference between on many occasions and a small number. As in other cases noted in these comments, GGNRA cites a source to say something different from what the source actually said.
Organization:
Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368786 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SEIS, page 374 uses Sime 1999 to say dogs could damage vegetation and soils, with resulting influences on vegetation, soils, and wildlife. In fact, Sime was discussing sensitive alpine habitat, of which there is none in the GGNRA. Using a citation to say something so incontrovertible as, dogs could damage vegetation and soils, simply illustrates GGNRAs desire to look scientific without actually being scientific. Sime 1999 is Chapter 8, Domestic Dogs in Wildlife Habitats from a larger document: Effects of Recreation on Rocky Mountain Wildlife: A Review for Montana. Committee on Effects of Recreation on Wildlife, Montana Chapter of the Wildlife Society. Chapter 9 of the larger document is devoted to the effects of recreationists on soils, vegetation, and water. There is even a section in Chapter 9 on trampling of vegetation. But nowhere in Chapter 9 are dogs mentioned. That clearly suggests that the scientists who actually studied soils and vegetation didnt find dogs to be a significant source of impact.
Organization:
Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368787 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SEIS, page 374, uses Sime 1999 to say that dogs could possibly [emphasis not in original] spread and establish new populations of invasive and/or non-native plants. It should surprise no one by now that Sime offers no evidence such spread by dogs has actually occurred. GGNRA made the dogs spread invasive plants claim in Negotiated Rulemaking and again in the Draft EIS, both times without any evidence. Repeating it a third time doesnt make it true, especially when no evidence is offered this time either.
Organization:
Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6180 **Comment Id:** 368827 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: TO SUMMARIZE, the NPS wants to classify the whole of the GGNRA, especially the areas used by humans and their dogs as areas to remove from human use. Every area is given a name to protect from us horrible humans such as DUNE... From page 258: In the study area at GGNRA, coastal dune habitat is found at Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston. There is also beach and coastal dune habitat at Stinson Beach,...

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/18/2014)

VU2010 Visitor Use and Experience: Affected Environment (Substantive)

1. **Commenters would prefer to continue the allowances and restrictions on dog walking as they currently exist, stating that the status quo allows the greatest variety of use among visitors. Many commenters state that watching the dogs off leash is part of the experience of Golden Gate National Recreation Area.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6 **Comment Id:** 337958 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: At Ocean Beach, where I live, huge numbers of dogs run off leash in the on leash areas on a daily basis. Today (Friday) is a sunny day at the beach, and I can guarantee you that there will be DOZENS of dogs down there - - and their owners - - who will be violating the CURRENT regulations. The dogs crap all over the beach (and owners dont' scoop), chase birds (including threatened species), jump up on people that want nothing to do with them (and have destroyed my headset for my iphone on one occasion when a dog jumped up and clawed my chest), and generally create havoc. Many dog owners are responsible with their pets, but many are not. When I have (courteously) informed some dog owners that their dog was off leash in an on leash area, I have been physically threatened, verbally abused and harassed.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Hill N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1153 **Comment Id:** 351780 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I regularly hike GGNRA trails around Tennessee Valley and Mill Valley. In the past year or so the increase in the number of people on the trails with dogs off leash is tremendous. I see 5 to 20 of them on almost every hike I take. All the trails I hike are either completely off limits to dogs or the dogs must be on a leash. I have pointed this out to dog owners many times, and not a single one has put their dog on the leash as a result of "learning" that their dog is required to be on a leash. Many times the owners feign ignorance or treat me as if I'm doing something wrong by pointing out their disregard of the regulations. I've called dog dispatch a few times, but they never seem to be available to come give out citations. If there isn't any way to enforce the current leash regulations then no dogs should be permitted on the trails at all.

Organization:

Commenter: Roberta Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3330 **Comment Id:** 358157 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As an avid devotee of the GGNRA trails and beaches, I can say without reservation that my dog and dog-owner encounters as a runner, hiker, biker, and beach comber

GGNRA160795

are overwhelmingly negative. From getting rushed by dogs both on and off leash, invariably jumped on, scratched (to the point of bleeding), and having my clothes torn, my picnics absconded with, my little kids growled at and pounced, and my trail shoes more often than not besmirched with dog poop, I am awash in major dog vexation. The trails are sullied, the environs trampled, the wildlife and people barraged with bad behavior - - both canine and human - - and anyone enjoying the GGNRA must constantly remain on the defensive, lest an "Oh, he's really friendly" dog seemingly leap out of nowhere to rattle the quiescence and beauty of the trails.

Organization:

Commenter: Kris Malone Grossman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4597 **Comment Id:** 361124 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a dog lover, dog, owner, and dog advocate, yet I feel that the dogs off leash at Fort Funston really interfere with the teaching program that is on-going between the SFUSD and the National Parks service. As a teacher, I was there on an overnight trip with my students. The proximity of the off leash area really interfered with our learning experience. We had some children who are extremely phobic. Many of the dog owners did not have command verbal of their pets. I believe there should be space for off-leash opportunities, but it should be limited to an area where educational goals are not being jeopardized.

Organization:

Commenter: alice m kowalsky **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5885 **Comment Id:** 364462 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a regular volunteer who not only enjoys working nearly 200 hours a year restoring and enhancing natural areas of the Presidio, I'm also a frequent user of the park, I inline skate, hike, bike and often simply sit in peace and quiet, watching and listening to the beauty around me. All of the activities listed above, including the volunteering, have been disturbed, interrupted, and or threatened by unleashed domestic pets on countless occasions. While many poorly trained, leashed pets are just as bad, at least they are somewhat constrained.

Organization:

Commenter: andrew morrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters had concern about the manner in which data was presented in the SEIS. Many commenters stated that the dog-related incidents are overstated because most are leash violations, the wildlife disturbance violations are very low and that the number of incidents was declining; however, one commenter pointed out that the incidents are underrepresented, as many incidents are reported. Other commenters were troubled with the presentation of information on minorities. Many commenters did not agree with the surveys used as a basis for determining impacts. For example, commenters did not feel that the visitor use surveys are representative of the use of the park and the 2002 Northern Arizona Study on dog**

walking was too general.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 54 **Comment Id:** 338925 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The statistics on dog incidents are grossly underrepresented. I have not formally reported these incidents - but just in the last 2 months, there were 4 dog related incidents at Chrissy Field Beach East involving my children and strongly, negatively impacting our experience and deterring us from future visits.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth K Le **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 488 **Comment Id:** 351775 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The law enforcement incident reports from 2008 through 2011 showed that there were 729 incidents reported for having a dog off leash within the Ocean Beach SPPA during the period (July 1 through May15) when dogs must be leashed. 1. This same data (Appendix G) shows the incidents of disturbing wildlife is very low or non-existent, most of the violations are related to leash law. 2. This same data (Appendix G) shows decreasing number of dog incidents from 2001-2006 before the new leash law 36 CFR 1.5, and then decreasing again From 2007-2011 after the new leash law 36 CFR 1.5 3. If compliance to current law is poor, why do think a ban of dogs altogether will be well complied with? Most people are very used to walking there dogs there now and will probably continue to do so since there are no other open space alternatives in the area The document identifies SPPA as a moderate dog walking area. If thats that case than monitoring and citations could be used to enforce the leash laws.

Organization:

Commenter: Tim Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 488 **Comment Id:** 351777 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Chapter 3 of the EIS Visitor Experience/Environmental Justice section The document states: Some ethnic or low-income populations may be more negatively affected by off-leash dog walking that is a ridiculous and unscientific conclusion to reach from a random phone survey. They cite a roughly 7% dfference in response between two income groups. Due to the uncontrolled nature of the informal survey that would be well within the error band; especially if there are very few respondents in any of the income groups. They also cite 11% o respondents thought the dogs discouraged use of GGNA by disadvantaged groups. Thats is a meaningless and highly subjective, speculative statement. The document states: Latinos expressed the most concern&For example, dog owners assume that other people will like the owners dogs as much as they do; dog owners let their dogs approach other people without first asking their permission; and owners do not react to their dogs begging for other peoples food. That is a completely absurd generalization. I, and many dog owners I know simply do not do that. This entire section of the document seems to me like NPS is grasping at straws and trying to link dog walking with negative affects on low-income groups, minorities and other disadvantaged groups. I find this tactic deplorable and highly offensive

Organization:
Commenter: Tim Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4872 **Comment Id:** 361662 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The 2008 and 2012 visitors surveys, upon which it appears the SEIS conclusions are based, are inherently flawed, thus making any conclusions regarding both current and future visitor use erroneous. In San Francisco County, the 2008 survey was conducted at Crissy Field, Baker Beach, and Ocean beach for four days (two weekdays, two weekend days) and the 2011 survey was conducted at Fort Funston (two weekdays, two weekend days). This is not a representative sample of park use.
Organization:
Commenter: Lynne Srinivasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5227 **Comment Id:** 362707 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The NPS cites a very general survey of public opinion on restricting dogs at the GGNRA conducted in 2002 by Northern Arizona University as support for its Plan. In the survey, 53% o respondents stated that they opposed allowing off-leash walking in GGNRA sites, while 40% wre in favor. The survey is too general to be of use. The GGNRA spans 117 square miles and contains 24 defined sites with dog walking / off-leash dog walking.
Organization:
Commenter: David Nielsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. **Many commenters enjoy seeing dogs running in the open areas of Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Commenters who gain pleasure from dogs at the park include dog owners and professional dog walkers, as well as many who do not own dogs. The commenters acknowledge that there are some irresponsible owners that do not watch their dogs, have unruly dogs, and don't pick up after their dogs; however, most dog owners are recognized as responsible for their dogs and respectful of other visitors.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1821 **Comment Id:** 354147 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: What struck me was the relaxed atmosphere of the beach and its visitors that day and I think that this vibe could be attributed to the dogs being there. THey broke down barriers and lead to strangers interacting with each other, chatting and enjoying a lovely afternoon. These interactions would not have happened if not for the dogs, who brought all together. It has been shown that dogs encourage people to exercise and improve quality of life.
Organization:
Commenter: shelley b maddex **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3776 **Comment Id:** 359499 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who is not a dog owner, it's something that brings me pride in where I live. It improves the experience of the city, and makes people more cohesive. People are more open to talking to dog owners and having those small interactions makes everyone's experience better!
Organization:
Commenter: Cara O'Shell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5076 **Comment Id:** 362159 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I do not usually walk with a dog, but do walk on Ocean Beach and Ft. Funston quite often. I find that dogs and their walkers are caring and responsible users of the GGNRA. I am happy to meet dogs and their owners. It just makes no sense to require dogs to be on a leash on a walk. It makes the walk worse for the human and the dog.
Organization: Sierra Club
Commenter: Robert G Donjacour **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

4. Dog waste is a large issue for some commenters. On top of unruly behavior from some dogs ruining the experience of recreating at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, these commenters state that dog waste, whether on the ground or in bags on the ground, detract from their visits to the park. Commenters are concerned about recreating in an area where so many dogs eliminate.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 2747 **Comment Id:** 357182 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Another huge issue is that there are dog owners and dog walkers that don't pick up after their dogs. Some don't pick it up and others leave the plastic bags full of dog poop on the trails. My students and I have stepped in dog poop on numerous occasions which could have been prevented.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4591 **Comment Id:** 361087 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I often see off leash dogs eliminating themselves on the path or on the grass where children (and adults) are playing - yet the dog owner is not there to pick up after his/her dog. We all should be enjoying the sights and views in these parks instead of keeping our eyes glued to the ground in order to avoid stepping in dog waste. Our children should be able to play in our parks without fear of landing a pile of dog poop.

Organization:
Commenter: Tony N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

5. Several commenters feel that dogs should be completely banned from certain areas or from Golden Gate National Recreation Area entirely.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1210 **Comment Id:** 351985 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I appreciate all you're doing to try to protect our environment. I feel dogs should not be off leash anywhere in the GGNRA. Voice command doesn't always stop a dog. I have been sprayed by wet dogs/ food on my blanket sniffed - not appreciated. Birds are chased by dogs and vegetation trampled. I don't want to go into GGNRA areas and have to worry about where/when dogs have defecated/urinated. I appreciate dogs being banned whereever possible from the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia DiLuzio **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1332 **Comment Id:** 352331 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not allow dogs in the National Parks. They are destructive to the environment and wildlife. They create an unwelcome and hostile atmosphere for human beings. On leash, off-leash it's all the same. I have not enjoyed any park experience in recent years due to the ever increasing dog population
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Other Comments:

Correspondence Id: 48 **Comment Id:** 338017 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I've limited my walking on Land's End, in Golden Gate park, in Sutro park, and in other places because there are so many people who refuse to leash their dogs, even though there are signs that clearly say dogs must be on leashes.

Organization:

Commenter: Amy N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 65 **Comment Id:** 338949 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Further, your report lists 2,775 dog-related incidents over a 4 year period. This is about 2 incidents per day across the tens of thousands of visitors per day. How does this compare to other incidents for other reasons? How many people fall down or otherwise hurt themselves each day and require park personnel assistence?

Organization:

Commenter: David Pollak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 40 **Comment Id:** 344091 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As it is now, my children do not have enough space to play without interference by some off leash dog and the risk of dog bites.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 125 **Comment Id:** 346276 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: 2. Dogs considered to be on "voice command" are not. They are not "obedience trained;" the dog responds if it feels like it. 3. Dog owners think that everyone likes/loves their pets sniffing, yapping, barking, drooling, etc, etc, but we don't. It's true that we shouldn't approach dogs with the assumption that they like strangers, but owners shouldn't encourage this. I've been almost knocked over & I've seen little kids on their backs before owner did anything. 4. Dog owners have an organized lobby & clubs, which the rest of us do not. We resent dog owners feeling of entitlement. When I was growing up, you kept your dog in your fenced yard. I commiserate with owners not having backyards in San Francisco, but it doesn't mean that all other open space is their domain.

Organization: 1550 Bay St Tenants Association

Commenter: Janora A Bulechek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 128 **Comment Id:** 346281 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a frequent jogger and hiker (3 times/week) at the sites I will comment on. In summary, I have experienced that only about Â½ of the off-leash dogs I encounter are truly under voice control. Dogs often run after me and occasionally bite me. I am often forced to stop running and ask the owner to get the dog under control. Often they cannot.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 139 **Comment Id:** 346298 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have been to GGNRA many times, and dogs are always a problem. I go to walk and observe nature, but my experience is to try to get owners to get their dogs under control and away from me, so I can watch other dogs chase wildlife and/or destroy habitat. 1) Off-leash dogs are almost never controlled. Even if they are truly under voice control, I have no way to compel an owner to actually control their dogs. 2) I fear being knocked over by out-of-control dogs. 3) Off-leash dogs deficate "out of sight" of their handlers, and pollute the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Travis H Hails **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 213 **Comment Id:** 350121 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Your statistics are flawed as you state an 11% icident rate for dogs. But more than half of the incidents are tickets for off leash. These should not be counted as if there was no off leash law these tickets would not have been given and the rate would be insignificant in some places and average around 4-5%

Organization:

Commenter: cheryl e traverse **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 219 **Comment Id:** 350134 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have collected data on the incidence of trail usage, dogs on and off leash, and have made incidental observations of wildlife usage as well. My findings are that off-leash dogs tend to drive out other recreational use of trails making them single-use trails. In particular, older people and young people with pre-school aged children are driven off of trails with heavy off-leash dog usage.

Organization:

Commenter: Roger D Harris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 319 **Comment Id:** 350575 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I was at Ocean Beach this afternoon and had a lovely time. I was delighted to see so many beautiful, joyous, playful, glorious dogs bounding around. I don't have a dog, and

am more of a cat person, truth be told. However, dogs need to run around at the beach- -and dogs generally are an enhancement to people's experience at the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Doran **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 347 **Comment Id:** 350650 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a visitor from the Boston area. I just wanted to comment on how wonderful I find the experience of a community that has areas that are so open to dogs. I especially delighted in the experience at Fort Funston. It is truly remarkable to see such a dynamic community interaction between hang gliders, dog groups, individuals including children and a beautiful environment... and it seems to work for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen T Wolf **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 355 **Comment Id:** 351005 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs provoke unneeded conflicts with other NP and NRA users and wildlife. NP and NRA visitor experience is diminished when confronted by barking dogs, whether on- or off-lease.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1031 **Comment Id:** 351457 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Only two times in these ten years has there been a person who has shown concern that my dogs were off leash. Both of these people mistakenly thought that it was illegal for my dogs to be off leash and that was the basis of their concern. My dogs were not even near them or threatening them in any way. When a person looks at my ten pound dog, who is standing next to my feet, from fifty feet away and tells me they have a problem with my dog. I KNOW that the problem is theirs, and that it is a mental problem.

Organization:

Commenter: deborah l riat **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1039 **Comment Id:** 351470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: During our recent visit to San Franscisco we stayed in the Marina District. The kids (ages 3 and 7) loved walking down to Crissy Field. There favorite place to play became where Chrissy Field Marsh flows into the bay. During one of our visits, we were over run by large dogs off-leash. I guess it is pretty well accepted by dog owners to take their dogs off-leash near this stream to allow the dogs to exercise. The dogs made a number of close runs by our

children and other children playing in the same area. This greatly frightened the children and we eventually left. The dog owners seemed not to care that the dogs were scaring the children or running by quite close (within a few feet; one dog actually licked my child).

Organization:

Commenter: Mark K Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1043 **Comment Id:** 351474 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the years that I have walked my dogs on the beach and surrounding areas, there has never been a time when I have come across problems with other dogs or dog owners disrespecting the environment or creating problems for others in their enjoyment of this area of natural beauty - to the contrary in fact. Many who use this area recreationally have approached me with their children or dogs to socialize them and have expressed pleasure in seeing the dogs play and run freely. Allowing dogs off leash in Muir Beach enhances the enjoyment of this area for others it certainly doesn't hamper it.

Organization:

Commenter: Victoria A Hamilton-Rivers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1049 **Comment Id:** 351485 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My main concern with this current issue at hand is with the dog walkers and their canine clusters. At Ft. Funston a friend & I were both harassed by one dog walker who told us it was his domain to bring dogs to this park because he was there everyday and we were not their everyday (we had both felt intimidated by one of his unleashed pets and asked him to leash it). In fact, there were so many dog walkers that day I have not returned to Ft. Funston because it turned out to be a very unpleasant experience constantly surrounded by packs of dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: S Polk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1054 **Comment Id:** 351492 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs visiting national parks & national recreation areas (eg, Golden Gate National Recreation Area) need to be on leash at all times. i personally object to dogs off-leash in all parks except in fenced areas. i regularly walk in various parks & recreation areas in Oakland, San Francisco & other parts of the Bay Area. I am offended by dogs bounding up to me, sometimes jumping on me, in their totally natural excitement & curiosity. i get enough of that walking the streets of Oakland. I would prefer not to hike or try to commune with nature in an area with off-leash dogs.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Laurie Umeh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1058 **Comment Id:** 351497 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The garbage cans at Crissy Field contain so much dog waste that you can smell them from several yards away. Also, I do not believe that any dogs should be off leash at all in these areas as they are a menace to wildlife and other park visitors. I have witness several dog fights, one at Ocean Beach that resulted in a dog dying due to another dog attacking it because the owners couldn't control the animals.

Organization:

Commenter: Anastasia r Beckett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1088 **Comment Id:** 351539 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The negative impacts from dogs and dog walkers is a regular and unpleasant experience. I have been bitten by small white fluffy dogs (off leash) with owners who swear that that has never happened before. I have been pushed to trail edges by dogs running ahead of or catching up to their absent owners. This is very, very common with trail runners who conveniently don't see where their dogs take a dump either. I have been given patches of poison oak after said dogs brush past my calves and ankles. I have been "greeted" by jumping, barking, "friendly" dogs who are clearly not under anyones control.

Organization:

Commenter: Carol Haggerty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1097 **Comment Id:** 351557 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I walk/run Ocean Beach at least five days a week and every dog owner that I view feels that they are exceptions and allow their dogs to run off leash. I have had large dogs run up and frighten me when sitting quietly on the beach. On most days there are more dogs than humans on the beach, and it is impossible to walk barefoot anymore for fear of stepping in dog waste. Even wearing shoes I am not able to keep my eyes on the ocean and the surrounding beauty, but must constantly look down to watch what I am stepping in.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1104 **Comment Id:** 351646 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have seen too many dogs who run out of visual sight of the owner. I have seen too many owners who may believe that their dog would be under voice command, but the dog does not come when called. I have been in nature reserves (leash required) areas where dog owners have frantically called to their dog for over a half hour and were still looking for the dog when we walked by. I have been told by dog owners that leash requirements do not apply because everyone takes their dog off leash in particular areas. I have had dog owners who look at me like I am being unfair when I ask them to call their dog. And I have had a dog or two take a

nip.
Organization:
Commenter: A L **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1110 **Comment Id:** 351656 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In the many contacts with dogs, both on and off leash, there have been hundreds of well-behaved, well-controlled dogs both off and on-leash. I would love a non-emotional count of the number of aggressive dog attacks vs the many well-behaved dogs on trails.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Gess **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1120 **Comment Id:** 351674 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In the 5 1/2 years I have been walking my dog daily on Alta trail and Oakwood Valley trail, I have encountered nothing but other content dog owners enjoying the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Tiffany A Turley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1141 **Comment Id:** 351699 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I fully support restricting unleashed dogs in the parks. Today I was at Ocean Beach and when I walked up the hill to the street I saw a sign saying that I was in the protected area for western snowy plovers (which I saw none of today, whereas when I moved here 12 years ago, I use to see them frequently). There was no difference along the areas of the beach that are supposedly protected, the dogs were running loose everywhere (I've also seen them loose in the netted area at Crissy Field). Dogs, like their human owners, are very destructive and do not stay out of "protected" areas, whether they have a fence around them or not, unless on a leash.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1152 **Comment Id:** 351779 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I appreciate nature and the community of other walkers I see out there. We are all very vigilant of cleaning up after our dogs. I always pick up any extra poops I see. Everyone else is as well. On Alto trail I often walk in about 3 miles and then turn round and walk back. In those cases when my dog poops I bag it and leave it for my return trip. Never once has the bag been there. This gives you an idea of how vigilant dog people are.
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Berson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 493 **Comment Id:** 351791 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I've lived in San Francisco for 7 years and have been a dog owner for only two. Alamo Square is our main park, but we (and I do mean myself and my dog) greatly enjoy the open spaces, other dogs, and their owners of Chrissy Field and Fort Funston. The benefits of having access to these areas are obvious: exercise, play, socialization.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1171 **Comment Id:** 351894 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: People are allergic to dogs, people are afraid of dogs, some people have PTSD from childhood maulings, and some people just don't like dogs and would like a public space to be free of their poop, barking and entitled walkers and owners. I'm one of them. A former Chrissy Field user who hasn't been there in two years for one reason. FEAR.
Organization:
Commenter: Douglas Holsclaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1174 **Comment Id:** 351909 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am so sick of dogs @ Rodeo Beach, Stinson Beach pissing on my lunch and fishing gear I have kind of given up fishing there. I reported to Rangers there and they don't seem interested. I have lived in Marin 75 years and I have never seen it this bad. Dog shit @ Stinson is terrible. People just leave it in the sand and kids play with it - so gross!
Organization:
Commenter: Mel Colombo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1181 **Comment Id:** 351929 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Many of us have been unable to use the GGNRA because of all the off-leash dogs. We are taxpayers too and are entitled to a safe and pleasant experience in the park. The sheer number of loose, barking dogs has made it a nightmare to use the GGNRA. I have been jumped on by dogs, startled, and have to look down when I walk to avoid stepping in dog poo.
Organization:
Commenter: Miriam A Moss **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1182 **Comment Id:** 351931 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I for one am tired of being forced out of the GGNRA due to all the off-leash

dogs dominating the entire GGNRA. The Federal Government needs to get a backbone and apply the same rules here as they do in the rest of the United States.

Organization:

Commenter: Miriam Moss **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1184 **Comment Id:** 351933 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please uphold the present laws that allow dogs off leash in the GGNRA. It is a joyful experience to allow my small, well behaved dog off leash. I hike about 3 times a week and I have only once encountered another dog that threatened my dog, nor has my dog ever been a threat to other hikers or their animals.

Organization:

Commenter: Donna McKee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1187 **Comment Id:** 351946 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Another concern with free running dogs is (1) enthusiastic slobbering on the clothes of unsuspecting hikers (sure, we have a washer at home; but who wants to walk around with dog paws and slobber on pants and shirts?)

Organization:

Commenter: Christian Paech **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1272 **Comment Id:** 352208 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I live right next to a trailhead, and I enjoy seeing people walk their dogs. I feel that we need more trails open for people to walk their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1273 **Comment Id:** 352209 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Also I do not feel the need to pick up after one's dog as long as the feces are off the main path or trails. Owners that leave feces on the walkway are inconsiderate of people with or without dogs. I do not have any ideas how to enforce this, but perhaps periodical ticketing and fines would help.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1273 **Comment Id:** 352211 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Designated areas for dog walking on leash, and other designated areas for off leash. I walk two small dogs on leash several times a week on Milagra Ridge. Usually other dogs are on leash, but owners with large dogs tend to let them off leash and take them on the narrow trails. I stay on the main paved road as I am never sure which large dogs would attack or cause harm to me or my small dogs.Signs are posted that all dogs must be on leash. If there were some designated areas for off leash and on leash it would be less likely that negative incidents would happen

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1314 **Comment Id:** 352294 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a dog owner and we use GGNRA off-leash areas frequently both for recreation and for health and well-being reasons. We use these areas responsibly and over the many years we have not noticed any abuse caused by other dogs and dog owners that justify the changes now proposed.

Organization:

Commenter: Peter Kwan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1350 **Comment Id:** 352377 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When we able to have dogs in our home I was excited to take the dogs to the many beautiful areas in San Francisco. This was a great social activity for myself and my dogs. My dogs are over 14 years old now. I have been taking my dogs off-leash several times a week, specifically to the beach and Fort Funston. What I have discovered is that my dogs NEED to be off leash. I can walk them on leash day, after day, but when their paws hit the sand and they can run, they are happy dogs. I am a happy person.

Organization:

Commenter: Michele Gachowski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1383 **Comment Id:** 352423 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I know there are great dog owners, but too many are NOT. I live across the street from Moscone Park on 1 side & Ft. Mason Great Meadow on the other; senior home The Heritage is on the other corner. Dogs are left to run "wild" & owners ignore their pets sniffing & jumping on kids & adults. If dog owners were so good, why do I see so much poop; or if picked up, then toss it when they think no one is watching? Besides dog feces, what about & why don't we hear anything about dog urine? Do people want to sit in it or have their kids play on urine-soaked grass?

Organization: 1550 Bay St Tenants Assn.

Commenter: Jan A Bulechek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1431 **Comment Id:** 352544 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have always enjoyed seeing dogs on these trails and have never seen a dog or dog-owner misbehave. It's one of the reasons I enjoy walking this trail, because the dogs make me smile.

Organization:

Commenter: Robin v Van Vliet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 614 **Comment Id:** 352730 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The very things that dogs love to do (run, play, chase, pounce, attack, dig, jump, defecate, etc.) are the same things that decimate sensitive wildlife populations, injure or kill a whole array of species (sensitive or not), threaten personal space and safety (particularly for seniors and children), and produce pollution and litter issues for people.

Organization:

Commenter: Juliet A Lamont **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 614 **Comment Id:** 352733 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are not enough dog-free trails in the San Francisco section of the GGNRA. It is hard for visitors to find a place to have a quiet, dog-free nature experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Juliet A Lamont **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 632 **Comment Id:** 352778 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The document mischaracterizes the level of dog noise and does not properly characterize the soundscape at Crissy Field. The document should fully consider the soundscape at Crissy Field, which in my experience, walking my dog regularly at Crissy Field, may include (depending on day/time of day) construction nose, emergency vehicles, highway traffic, kids yelling, music, crowds, noise from equipment removing trees, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Block **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1462 **Comment Id:** 352828 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Furthermore, even on the trails that are supposed to be "on leash only" we still encounter rough and rowdy off leash dogs that don't hesitate to jump on a small child and owners who become indignant when we say things like," can you call your off your dog, he's afraid of dogs." It's become so unpleasant we've all but stopped using the trails, which is deeply frustrating since part of the reason we bought our house was it's close proximity to all the great

GGNRA hiking.
Organization:
Commenter: Arianna Orleans **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1467 **Comment Id:** 352848 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My family and I walk regularly with our dogs on the GGNRA trails. Our dogs stay on the trails and we always pick up after them.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1473 **Comment Id:** 352863 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: i believe all dogs should be required to be on leashes. unfortunately there are many dogs with owners who haven't trained them or are so busy doing their own thing that they let their dogs run freely to the detriment not only of wild life but also to those of us who just want a pleasant walk by our beautiful ocean without having to contend with out of control dogs and their neglectful owners.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1477 **Comment Id:** 352872 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, I am a responsible pet owner, I leash my dog if we are walking the beach and come upon a family picnicking to avoid my dog accidently kicking sand on them, and my dogs relish the time they get to spend fetching in the waves and rolling in the sand. Please don't take this away from them.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1484 **Comment Id:** 352882 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Watching him run with his ears flapping and his tongue hanging out brings me great delight. We have very fun afternoons walking and playing with the other dogs at Fort Funston or at Crissy Field. Taking him out keeps me healthy and active. Please make off-leash areas a priority. Dogs need places to run and humans need places to exercise with their dogs. There are not enough places as it stands. Let's not close the few areas we have.
Organization:
Commenter: Alison Mazzola **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1497 **Comment Id:** 352919 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On this issue alone, without even considering the environmental degradation of 100's of dogs running in every direction leaving feces and especially repulsive dog feces bags everywhere, this rule is rarely abided by dog owners and I've never seen it enforced. This has lead me to experience deep fear, discomfort, and embarrassing moments when I should be in a hoped for peaceful, commune with nature. Instead dogs have chased me, attacked me, growled at me, bared their fangs at me - not just large canines but small nasty ones as well.

Organization:

Commenter: Marci V Scileppi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1497 **Comment Id:** 352920 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I owned and lived on a working sheep and horse ranch for 10 years. I had between 4-6 dogs at any given moment. They were trained to round up sheep. I have many years of experience as a dog owner. I know when voice command works because I used it and my dogs listened or my flock was doomed. There is a complete lack of voice command at the Fort Funston to Ocean Beach area. There are dog fights on a daily basis. Dogs trespass beyond the fence barriers and the owners do not care nor do they control their charges.

Organization:

Commenter: Marci V Scileppi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1500 **Comment Id:** 352925 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please please keep Fort Funston open to off-leash dogs. I've taken my white golden retriever Grady there many times...it's his favorite place in San Francisco. He loves the beach; I believe all dogs do! Our dog-walking service Active Dog Adventure Club takes pack walks at Fort Funston on a regular basis along with many others. The area is very well used and taken care of by all. In all the times I've been to Fort Funston I've found all the dogs to be well behaved and well cared for. The dog owners have always been respectful of others and the environment, being careful to pick up after their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Cynthia L Cadua **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1505 **Comment Id:** 352937 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog enjoys running along side me on the beach. He is on voice control and I CLEAN UP HIS LITTER WHEN IT HAPPENS! Please don't close the beaches to dogs. Even before I got a dog, dogs added to the positive experience I had walking or running on the beach. To see a happy dog playing in the sand makes me and others happy.

Organization:

Commenter: Cat Major **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1521 **Comment Id:** 352987 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Of course people should be able to play catch with their dogs, but not everywhere. I don't appreciate dogs running at me our of nowhere (like, on trails), I don't like them running over my beach blanket, or eating my picnic. My last bad experience was this summer having a dog urinate on my umbrella at Crissy Field and the owner didn't even notice. We just have so many people as it is that use these popular places that adding dogs and people's inattention to the mix causes a real pain
Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 1540 **Comment Id:** 353040 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I regularly take my dogs to Crissy Field for a good run up and down the beach. It is the safest place to play fetch and I've never had a problem with other dogs or dog owners. Everyone is respectful of one another and the dogs are happy.
Organization:
Commenter: Maureen Morgan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 730 **Comment Id:** 353062 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is impossible to enjoy a run along Land's End Trail or Ocean Beach because one is constantly being chased by unleashed dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 741 **Comment Id:** 353079 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is a shame that this jewel of a park is being degraded from off leash dogs that can ruin a walk by jumping on you or harassing your dog who is behaving on a leash. Parks are for everybody, not just to the dog people who are let their dogs roam free while they are yacking on the phone and not taking responsibility for their dog(s).
Organization:
Commenter: lida rud **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1555 **Comment Id:** 353096 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Most dog owners do not have sufficient voice control over dogs, and when

hiking, I do not want a strange dog running up to me.

Organization:

Commenter: Sandra Yagi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 744 **Comment Id:** 353105 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My personal experience is that dogs off leash degrade my enjoyment of nature, especially at the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1565 **Comment Id:** 353109 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However, residents who are simply uncomfortable around dogs do not have special claim to access areas frequented by dogs. Just as I cannot take my dog to many public areas (state parks, beaches, etc.) these individuals could choose to frequent one of these many alternative public spaces where dogs are not allowed. I do not find these points in the SEIS to provide any compelling evidence of the need for the restrictions proposed in the 'preferred alternative plan.'

Organization:

Commenter: Megan Price **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1675 **Comment Id:** 353525 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is nothing so disconcerting as having an unleashed do run over your picnic and the owner laugh it off with a cute smile and a "so sorry" , it doesn't bring back the moment of enjoyment nor the adrenalin spike you feel when rushed by a wayward dog. I believe the GGNR was created for the "enjoyment of people" not the enjoyment of dogs. PLEASE KEEP UNLEASHED DOGS OFF OF MUIR BEACH.

Organization:

Commenter: Greg G Maloney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1716 **Comment Id:** 353684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are part of that community, and these areas represent logical places for dog walking. But the number of off-leash dogs has become unsustainable, and commercial dog walkers are abusing their free access to these areas. The limit of six dogs/person is especially important, as is enforcement of leash laws in sensitive wildlife areas. I believe that voice control of off-leash dogs is rarely happening.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1721 **Comment Id:** 353694 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: From my experience, park users have been responsible with their pets and I have never witnessed any serious problems between dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Karl Becker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1725 **Comment Id:** 353701 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As soon as we enter the westbound or northbound section of our footprint, offleash dogs are everywhere, often barking, running up to kids and pooping everywhere, I mean everywhere. There is a heavily used unloading zone on the north side of our building that is really used as a big poop pit. It is very sad to see the park disrespected and full of dog poop and trash. Even more than that, it is sad to see the off-leash walkers and up to 20 dogs in tow trampling through the restored native plant regions that we use to teach, even more frustrating is dog walkers interrupting our programming of kids in the middle of a game, or exploring the sand/beach for the first time in their life, and the walkers asking us to 'move our kids' out of the way b/c "this is an off-leash dog park" and "can't we go somewhere else".
Organization: SFUSD Environmental Science Center
Commenter: Lisa Wojcik **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1741 **Comment Id:** 353723 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have lived in other cities and consider the lax dog rules in San Francisco to be unsafe and unfair. I feel unsafe around other people's off leash dogs and don't think my family should be forced to interact with other people's dogs when I go to a public park.
Organization:
Commenter: Holly Warren **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1800 **Comment Id:** 354094 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Overall, my experience of public spaces is never enhanced by others dogs, rather, there is an indifference, or a negative impact. Super negative when I see their excrement left behind.
Organization:
Commenter: Shaun P Madden **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1807 **Comment Id:** 354119 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a frequent enjoyer of the GGNRA, I am happy to encounter off-leash dogs and I feel they are a great enhancement to the enjoyment of all.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen A Waxman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1826 **Comment Id:** 354266 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I enjoy dogs but I have witnessed many people and their children getting harassed by enthusiastic off-leash dogs, and even aggressive dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1836 **Comment Id:** 354312 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also, many people without dogs enjoy the spontaneous energy that is create when dogs are allowed to play in a respectful manner.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen Nichols **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1842 **Comment Id:** 354336 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I fully support the new dog management plan. Priority needs to be given to the protection of the park, its natural features and wildlife, which - esp. in an urban area - - is already subject to massive stress. The damage done by dogs, and esp off-leash dogs - - is very obvious at Fort Funston, which looks like a devastated area. I no longer want to walk there. It is depressing to look at.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara M Bernhart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1849 **Comment Id:** 354349 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Why should we as urban citizens, who love our parks just as much or more than the dog owners, have to put up with marauding packs of animals, dodging both them and their ubiquitous feces and fearing to lie in grass that has been fouled by preceding droves of dogs?
Organization: retired
Commenter: Rounscival S Harrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 983 **Comment Id:** 354353 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: meet my 75 year old mom with her dog a Queensland Red Heeler an Australian

Cattle Dog at Crissy field on the weekends to walk with. Queensland Red Heelers dogs are some of the longest living dog breeds, so its important they get a good workout by being able to run freely. We have enjoyed this activity for many years. The walk takes us over 2 miles. This keeps me and my Mom healthy. With the dog off leash he can run in the sand and surf. This keeps the dogs health maintained, as we simply can not run at the proper speed needed for the dog if he had to be leash bound. For both of us its the most beautiful area we have seen and Crissy Field for us with its stunning views and landscape is an amazing place to be. Historically the area has worked well for many families and dog owners generally very respectful of each other. It simply would not be fair to the dog owners and other folks impacted who use San Francisco parks to lose Crissy Field's status as a dog friendly park. My Mother and her dog are very healthy for there age and it is because she has the dog she has to get out and walk this dog everyday. I feel this is a great social resource that can and should be shared. In my experience we have always have had good and positive time at Crissy Field. There are many good reasons to keep the park off leash dog friendly and I hope I was able to express at least one today.

Organization:

Commenter: Danny Ames **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 990 **Comment Id:** 354364 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: For over thirty years I have shared the joy of walking my dogs off-leash at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and occasionally at Crissy Field. This has been of great benefit to my dogs, enabling them to be well socialized around other dogs, and people. Dogs and humans interact well in these areas and I have seen or heard only a handful of inconsiderate or rude interactions in all that time; far fewer than I can experience walking down the street! Fort Funston is a place where I find community. It gives those of us who love dogs as much pleasure to watch our animals romp and play as it does parents watching their children at a playground - both delightful, refreshing experiences in a day.

Organization:

Commenter: Ruth Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1853 **Comment Id:** 354377 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am pleased to see this new expansion to keep dogs out of the park. I go to Crissy Field frequently with my child. We have been jumped on by off-leash dogs, a dog once peed on our beach bad, and there is always dog poop on the ground. Dog owners always apologize and say "my dog is friendly." They seem to not care that not everyone likes dogs and many of us do not want to pet their dogs not be tackled by them. They don't care that children might be afraid of a dog bounding up to them and knocking them off their feet.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1869 **Comment Id:** 354404 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We are not dog owners, but we really enjoy watching the dogs, off lease, play and swim at Crissy Field sandy beach areas.The owners, especially the dog walkers, are so responsible and friendly.....just great . Hope for no one, no document, no restrictions to this pleasure.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A davis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1871 **Comment Id:** 354411 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: While the sights and sounds of these beautiful outdoor recreational areas are enjoyable, it is most often the times when Baxter is wandering, running and playing off-leash that makes the experience truly satisfying and restorative for us both.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael J Harrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1872 **Comment Id:** 354413 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having had dogs run up to me and my child while the dog is unleashed is anything but pleasant. Our outdoor experience is negated further by the ubiquitous comment, "don't worry, she's friendly." Additionally when I do see dogs leashed and unleashed on grassy areas of the park, that area becomes off limits to me because of the animals crapping on the grass. It has been my experience that I always pick one of those spots, the result being is that my family avoids playing on the grass rather than risking an encounter with dog "skid marks." There has not been a time when I have not witnessed off leash dogs either rummaging through personal items, urinating or becoming uninvited guess with my experience at the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Edward Lopez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1875 **Comment Id:** 354416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Just today, I returned to Crissy Beach East with my two young children (2 and 4 years old) and was again, bombarded by at least 4 off-leash dogs whose owners had no voice control over their behavior; these dogs' behavior included urinating on my children's toys, digging through our backpacks and picnic basket for food and growling and threatening myself and my children when I attempted to shoo them away. And these same self-righteous dog owners threatened to call animal protective services on me for trying to protect my property and my children from their dogs. I told them that if they did not have control over their dogs, they need to be leashed. They only finally left with their dogs when I said that I would be happy to call the authorities for them regarding their dogs' behavior.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Le **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1901 **Comment Id:** 354503 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The big problem continues to be lax enforcement of existing regulations. I cannot tell you how many times I have been trying to photograph rare and/or sensitive birds or animals and have had inconsiderate dog owners allow their dogs to terrorize the birds and animals right in front of me. And when I point out that the area is posted that dogs must be on leash they just laugh.

Organization:

Commenter: Joseph Morlan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1909 **Comment Id:** 354525 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I can no longer use the GGNRA or even the city parks, due to my countless frightening episodes with out of control dogs and their often rude walkers.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1909 **Comment Id:** 354527 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are destructive to the very things that so many of us come to the national parks to experience: wildlife and the peace that only nature can provide; a respite from city life.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1912 **Comment Id:** 354530 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston is a unique space to go with your dog in that you can walk along the beach and ocean or hike along the hillside cliffs. I can see the joy and excitement in my dog, and all other dogs we meet along our way, from being able to run, play and frolic in this amazing space. It would be a true loss to change Fort Funston.

Organization:

Commenter: Betsy Magen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1914 **Comment Id:** 354536 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Now, if we are talking about improving the park-going experience of those without dogs, there are certainly better ways to go about the issue than effectively blocking access to and decreasing the possibility for enjoyment of local recreational areas for the enormous population of dog owners in the area.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicole M Turnipseed **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1930 **Comment Id:** 354570 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a frequent user of the GGNRA and off-leash dogs severely detract from my experience of the parks. It is quite appropriate to limit off-leash dogs in certain areas for the protection of wildlife and the fuller enjoyment of visitors who want to avoid dog disturbance.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard W Horrigan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1944 **Comment Id:** 354586 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In all cases, I oppose allowing dogs off-leash. A recent visit to Crissy Field (December 2013), for example, was made much less pleasant by the sheer number of dogs darting about, some fighting with each other, others coming up to me and my family, which made us quite uncomfortable. In fact, I am much, much less likely to visit Crissy Fiedl again due to the sheer number of dogs off leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Petrosky **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1947 **Comment Id:** 354591 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In the past my family and I have greatly enjoyed visiting the Presidio of San Francisco as well as other areas in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. But recently we have chosen to visit much less often as our experience when we do, has been greatly affected by the number of dogs we have encountered.
Organization:
Commenter: Karl Young **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1964 **Comment Id:** 354622 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'd like to come visit and not have to worry about being harassed by a dog, stepping in dog feces, or seeing dogs chase birds. Even if it wasn't a National Park I would like to come visit and not have to go through all that.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1980 **Comment Id:** 354644 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are people who are afraid of dogs and those people have to right to know

that they can go to places where there will be no dogs or at least know that the dogs will be on leash and in COMMAND and CONTROL of their owners. Many a person who is fearful of dogs have become so due to the lack of control or lack of a leash. It would be wonderful if parents could be assured that there places that they can take their child/ren to a dog-free place where the child could run freely. I find it disgusting that some dog owners go into tot play area with their dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Naomi I Lidicker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1988 **Comment Id:** 354654 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to oppose the plan for restricting the size of off leash areas in the GGNRA including Crissy Field, Ft. Funston, Baker Beach and other areas. Off leash dog walking and dog play is a normal and non-disruptive recreational activity enjoyed not only by dog owners but also by their friends and many other visitors who do not own dogs but appreciate having them around and seeing them play. Allowing off leash activities does not meaningfully affect other users of a semi-natural recreation area. I support that some areas of GGNRA should be on leash only where pets could affect the park experience for others, including some portion of the Crissy field beach set aside primarily for people and children; however, the proposed plan goes far beyond any reasonable balance and should be changed.

Organization:

Commenter: Phillip Sprincin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2885 **Comment Id:** 354917 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I recreate with my dog in the off leash areas of the GGNRA often and it's a wonderful part of the Bay Area experience, both for people (including non-pet owners) and pets.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Matthew Goforth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2947 **Comment Id:** 355255 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Being able to enjoy nature's beauty with our 4 legged family members is one of the reasons I live here, and I hope you will consider the importance of this access to residents and also how much undue stress this plan will add to city dog parks and neighborhoods.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Kimberly Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2974 **Comment Id:** 355294 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I actually do not oppose the plan because many dog owners are not responsible

when they use parks or public recreation lands with their dogs. It's quite com mon they let the dogs run free. It's hard to go for a walk without being bothered by unleashed dogs. I have been attacked and bitten by free running dogs before when on Ocean Beach.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Alan Hightman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3128 **Comment Id:** 355387 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash dog play is crucial to my dog's health and socialization and walking freely in these areas allows me to enjoy them for exactly what they are intended for: recreation.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Helen Cleary **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3669 **Comment Id:** 355587 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Why didnt SEIS list the many com ments from regular citizens who walk there? I walk several places in the GGNRA, and have for years, with my dog & kids, and have never had a negative encounter with any people, with or without dogs. People, dogs and recreation are all peacefully co-existing. It is a beautiful thing and that the SEIS report didnt tell that story is ABSURD!

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: catharine Clune **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4175 **Comment Id:** 355942 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... This is a National Recreation area. Not a reserve. Not a park. Not a national protected area. Recreational means for the enjoyment of the com munity. Dogs and the ability to play and run with your dog are an important part of family and com munity life.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Lee Bernstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5367 **Comment Id:** 356029 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...I am a non-dog owner who delights in the happiness of my fellow dogowning citizens and their pets when I walk throughout the trails of Fort Funston, near my home. It is one of the most special places in SanFrancisco. I adore the dogs, have NEVER had a problem with the pet owners or their animals!

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Kathryn Ovcina **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5369 **Comment Id:** 356031 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because, as a dog owner, the joy my well-trained dog brings to me and the people in my com munity far exceeds the limited damage NPS claims she and other dogs do to OUR GGNRA. The NPS claims are widely unsupported by fact, analysis or survey. In my time spent over 15 years taking care of my past and current dog, 95% o the dog owners I encounter every day are thoughtful, respectful and environmentally conscious about how they use the park systems, including clean-up and adherence to park rules.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Nancy Castelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2621 **Comment Id:** 356914 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There I took under-served youth from low income neighborhoods on nature hikes so they could learn about San Francisco's natural history, geology as well as observe native wildlife. Many of these students come from neighborhoods where they've experienced trauma in the form of aggression or attacks by dogs. I was appalled at how many rude and harassing comments I received from dog walkers who got angry when I asked them to keep their animals on leash around my student groups. Dogs jumped on my students, knocked them over and at pieces of their lunch right out of their hands.

Organization:

Commenter: Thea Zajac **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2673 **Comment Id:** 357033 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a senior citizen who does not have a dog but I go to Fort Funston every morning and I can tell you that offleash dogs are not a problem out there. People walking their dogs make the park safer for everyone because they are out 24/7, rain or shine.

Organization:

Commenter: Margaret Best **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2688 **Comment Id:** 357074 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To whom it may concern, I just wanted to say that I support the dog management plan for several reasons. I support the goal of restoring the coastal habitat for all creatures, and I find that at several coastal spots the number of dogs- often with professional dog walkers- is so immense that I feel like I am walking through a dog bathroom on my way to the beach. I hope that they still have a spot within SF to go off leash, but I do feel that space should be far more restricted than it is now.

Organization:
Commenter: Sara Brothers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2690 **Comment Id:** 357079 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: You won't see more than fifteen or twenty docile dogs the whole time you're here, trotting down the trails, minding their own business, jumping for joy. It's a pretty simple picture of human and dog, getting some exercise.
Organization: Montara Dog Group
Commenter: Arthur I Hofmayer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2744 **Comment Id:** 357161 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have never - - not once - - had a bad experience related to dogs in the GGNRA, either when walking or running with my own dogs or when encountering other people with dogs. I have never encountered a loose dog without an owner or seen any negative effect of the policy of allowing dogs on leash in this part of the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Peter A Peterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2746 **Comment Id:** 357180 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On beaches where dogs are not leashed, though required, I have been knocked down by racing dogs, had food snatched from my hand, have been peed* on while sitting and watching waves and birds. I have seen owners urge their racing dogs (Limantour) to chase into four flocks of 800 resting shorebirds and cheer their ability scatter them. *On one occasion, I spoke to park personnel shortly afterwards, and was told that dogs are territorial and acted badly sometimes....
Organization:
Commenter: Ellen @ Barth **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2747 **Comment Id:** 357181 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On numerous walks with our students we have been literally overrun by dogs. Many dog walkers come to Fort Funston with 10-15 dogs per person and most of the time all of these dogs are off leash and not on voice command. Many times dogs have scared our students literally running up to them or running them over. While its true that some of these times the owners/walkers are aware of the situation and try to call their dogs off, most of the times the dogs just don't listen. More often than not the owner/walker is nowhere in sight and so we are left with screaming and scared students and a dog or dogs that won't leave us alone.
Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2799 **Comment Id:** 357502 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Although dogs can be enjoyable to watch, and animate the park, I have witnessed numerous instances where out of control dogs have ruined picnics, disturbed Scrabble games, shaken wet and sandy fur onto unsuspecting visitors, and have generally behaved badly while the owners act unapologetic or even defensively when asked to control their animals. I am a dog lover and a regular visitor to Crissy Field, but it is an unpleasant thought to imagine the very place I will be resting my hand may have only moments before been used as a dog toilet.
Organization:
Commenter: Tim Wells **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2855 **Comment Id:** 357661 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also I have had a few encounters where people yelled at me for having my dogs off lease ,for no reason at all. If you are scared of dogs, or have an aggressive or unruly dog, maybe you shouldn't go to where there is open space where you are likely to encounter other dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Roy Gulick **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2860 **Comment Id:** 357678 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash dog play is crucial to my dog's health and socialization and walking freely in these areas allows me to enjoy them for exactly what they are intended for: recreation.
Organization:
Commenter: Helen N Cleary **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2863 **Comment Id:** 357682 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not ban off leash dogs at beaches. Parks and beaches are to be shared and among all of us and removing our rights to enjoy the park/beach with our pets is unfair and unjust. Most of grew up with memories of running on the beach, swimming and playing with our dogs. I want to be able to pass the experience with my children. PLEASE COME UP WITH AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN WHERE EVERYONE CAN SHARE THE BEACH!
Organization:
Commenter: Jessica Javier **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3027 **Comment Id:** 357719 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The dog walkers especially on Alta trail will usually have 7 dogs each, all of leash. There will usually be 5 different groups of dog walkers creating an absolute nightmare scenario. It is impossible to enjoy the trail when out of control dogs are everywhere. I should not have my enjoyment of these trails dismissed because the "dog walkers" have taken over this space. These people are earning a living doing this, not someone who's taking the family dog out for a walk. I'm a dog owner and appreciate being able to take my dog to some of these places, but I'm sick and tired of having my experience ruined by a business using a public resource for their personal gain. I think anyone with more than 3 dogs should be held to a different standard and not allowed to use the public resources like this

Organization:

Commenter: Serena Dugan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3033 **Comment Id:** 357744 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need people and people need dogs. For both to be happy, dogs need to run and be free to play! Watching this in my everyday life brings joy to me and my hundreds of dog friends community I've built through the years.

Organization:

Commenter: Annie Sammis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3068 **Comment Id:** 357875 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And while it may sound ridiculous, enjoying GGNRA with dogs brings people together and plays a major role in bringing joy to the lives of Marin residents, and tourists (Bay Area and beyond). This includes me and my family.

Organization:

Commenter: Joseph Zwillinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3079 **Comment Id:** 357890 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Watching the dogs play enhances the area unbelievably! My daughter lives in San Francisco and one of her favorite things to do is to go by Crissy Field and watch the dogs and play with some of them. The dogs are all having a great time and not causing any problem every time we're there. They're very good for the area and are not a detriment at all. It's much more fun to visit there when there's a good amount of dogs there playing together and chasing sticks or balls - even way out into the water.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda L Marquardt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3213 **Comment Id:** 357988 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Imagine a young mother and her 1 year old son peacefully enjoying a picnic in the grass. All mom could do to protect her baby was hover over him while she took the blow. Old Buddha, the dog, proceeded to lift his leg and pee all over mom's back. Incorrigible. This wouldn't have happened if Buddha was on leash. End of story. I have heard other reports of off leash dogs snatching food from other picnickers. Another mom park-goer recounted the time a dog ran up and snatched a sandwich from her husband's hands as he was about to take a bite. Situations like this happen all too frequently with dogs running wild in public parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Allison Madden **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3280 **Comment Id:** 358042 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On mount Tamalpais, rangers have to ticket off leash dogs all the time. Tourists come from far away to see this beautiful mountain and paths often are littered with dog feces and colored dog excrement bags that were left behind. At Stinson Beach where there is actually a designated dog beach area, owners allow their dogs to run down the beach in the "leashed" area running over a family's blanket who is picnicing, chasing birds or leaving excrement even on the "no dog" side of the beach. In asking an owner to please clean up after her dog, I have been told multiple times how difficult it is to see all the dogs going to the bathroom when they all go at the same time. Ironically, this is usually the case in a leashed area.

Organization:

Commenter: Sandy g Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3286 **Comment Id:** 358045 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Whether you have a dog or not, its a joyful experience to be in the bay area with dogs off leash running free or at the parks the a leash. It allows people to feel a sense of community to the have your friends, family and dogs gather together.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Naleppa **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3317 **Comment Id:** 358132 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We get such a tremendous enjoyment and connection with our community and neighboring communities by walking as a family in off leash areas. It creates a tremendous feeling of pride and allows us to not only bond as a family but bond with other walkers who may or may not have dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Suwanna Kerdkaew **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3333 **Comment Id:** 358160 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have witnessed harassment of wildlife by off-leash dogs several times in the GGNRA, and I have been harassed myself by off-leash dogs. In fact, I avoid areas in the GGNRA where dogs are allowed to run by their owners

Organization:

Commenter: Andrew C Rush **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3341 **Comment Id:** 358187 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Listening to dog owners yell at dogs supposedly under voice control is very unpleasant. As a birdwatcher, my ears are constantly working at interpreting bird vocalizations. I recreate on NPS lands to enjoy natural sounds, not to listen to intrusive shouting.

Organization:

Commenter: Emilie N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3347 **Comment Id:** 358200 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a retired veterinarian and animal owner. However I am concerned over the irresponsible and intrusive behavoir of many dog owners. I was at an exhibit (not for dogs) and had to trip over ill behaveddogs and stepo over dog feces which were not picked up.

Organization: Audubon Society, Amer Veterinary Association

Commenter: Roy Henrickson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3354 **Comment Id:** 358222 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I cannot imagine not being able to enjoy these areas with my dogs. I walk, bike, rollerblade in these areas with my dogs as well as have them swim in the bay. Being able to do this with them has added so much to my life and theirs.

Organization:

Commenter: Marnie Wright **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3358 **Comment Id:** 358231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please understand that having a dog on-leash is NOT the same as having a dog off-leash. Dogs should be able to run around by themselves without the constraint of leashes in these great outdoor areas. Keep in mind that dog owners also enjoy the freedom of watching their dogs roam around happily.

Organization:

Commenter: Allen Miao **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3362 **Comment Id:** 358237 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Our City has become over run with dogs and there does need to be controls on where they can be off leash and it needs to be enforced, please. I am afraid of big dogs and I therefore avoid Crissy field (which used to be my FAVORITE place to run and hang out with my kids - no more) and Fort Funston.
Organization: Private user
Commenter: Cathy Ritter **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3369 **Comment Id:** 358255 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am in support of the continuation of the off the leash at Crissy Field. My wife and I go there a lot and we really enjoy the exuberance and pleasure to dogs show when they're running around. They come up to us sometimes but our only problem is getting licked and that a wonderful thing. Let them run free, please.
Organization:
Commenter: Thomas Berman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3370 **Comment Id:** 358256 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I do not hike where dogs are allowed on trails. Dogs reduce the chance of seeing wildlife, they make noise that detracts from the sound of quiet and of nature, they leave feces on the trail, and they require attention to judge if they could cause harm when I meet them on a trail. Domesticated animals, like dogs, put a stress on wild animals and do not belong in non-domesticated places.
Organization:
Commenter: Kevin Kingma **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3374 **Comment Id:** 358275 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is also a quality of life issue for those of us who enjoy walking in the area - roaming packs of dogs cutting across the dunes detract from the beauty of the landscape and disrupt the ecosystem
Organization:
Commenter: Mary D Lucid **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3390 **Comment Id:** 358311 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs do more than just scare away wildlife, they kill wildlife, their owners

neglect to clean up properly after them which creates a dirty smelly environment, which also can spread disease. Dogs can be aggressive to children as well and may fight with eachother. In general they disturb the peaceful quiet use of the GGNRA and threaten the very wildlife we go there to enjoy

Organization: Ms.

Commenter: laura woodford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3391 **Comment Id:** 358314 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: An important reason why people visit parks is the serenity and beauty there. Many dog owners are respectful of others and many dogs are well-trained. But San Francisco also has its share of irresponsible dog owners, and out-of-control dogs. This can be a threat, not only for our varied wildlife, but also for our citizens, especially children and seniors. Also the presence of too many dogs degrades the natural environment of the park. We all deserve a place where we can relax and enjoy our precious coastline without being disrupted by unruly dogs and their natural instincts to chase after wildlife - or people

Organization:

Commenter: Amy Haskell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3398 **Comment Id:** 358324 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: So many of us would like to be able to enjoy the outdoors in our parks and not be confronted with dogs on the loose, with little bags of abandoned dog waste, and with the disruption of wildlife that are the hallmarks of too many uncontrolled pets in a limited space.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Anne K Kelley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2469 **Comment Id:** 358976 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I can't count the number of times a nice day at Funston has ended with dog feces on the sole of my, or my children's, shoe. Additional packs of dogs led by walkers are almost always roaming the beaches playing with each other with no regard for small children. Several times we've had to physically intervene with dogs before they've run over kids.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3425 **Comment Id:** 359182 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As longtime residents of Marin County, I and my family have spent a lot of time on GGNRA land. It is a place where we can enjoy the beauty and quiet of nature. We are also avid birders and conservationists. Although we own dogs, we do not take our dogs walking

on GGNRA land because we do not want to frighten the birds or other wildlife. Our walks in GGNRA have often been sullied by dogs running around off-leash, dogs approaching us in a way that is overly friendly (I do not want to be jumped on or aggressively sniffed by any dogs, but especially not strange dogs), their owners yelling to them, and the countless piles of dog poop that dog owners don't bother to pick up, or the plastic bags of dog poop that dog owners leave by the side of the trail.

Organization:

Commenter: Alexandra Matthews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3556 **Comment Id:** 359198 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When I hike, I welcome the chance to greet the dogs I meet on my way. When I walk on the beach, the freedom of dogs running and greeting other dogs is an integral part of the wild and wonderful beach experience. In 50 years of hiking the GGNRA hills, I have never had a bad encounter with an off leash dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Marabeth Grahame **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3557 **Comment Id:** 359208 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I drove past Fort Funston for several years before I finally made it there for a hike. I was so saddened by the experience I have never been back. This wonderful sandy ocean-side natural environment was so overused that it smelt strongly of dog urine, and it was a breezy day.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3611 **Comment Id:** 359257 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Time and time again, I see dogs off leash in places where they are supposed to be on leash. I have learned that "under voice control" is a fictional state. I have seen plastic bags of dog poop scattered along trails. I have encountered dog owners who aggressively insist on their rights to break the rules. A friend of mine broke his hip after an off-leash dog ran in front of his bicycle on the Railroad Grade. The dog owners ran off.

Organization: self

Commenter: Eve Pell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3717 **Comment Id:** 359394 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Moreover, on two occasions in recent years I have been with a young child who has been traumatized by being pounced on by an enthusiastic over rambunctious off-leash dog

that did not respond to its owner's verbal commands - - once last summer when a child I was with was almost five and on another occasion with a child who was probably four at the time.

Organization:

Commenter: Julie Bongers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3745 **Comment Id:** 359449 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash dogs under voice control are a staple of dog and dog owner enjoyment alike.

Organization:

Commenter: Mark Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3780 **Comment Id:** 359600 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On multiple occasions we have witnessed and/or experienced the following at specific GGNRA areas: " Children under two years of age, including our own children, being knocked down by unsupervised/unleashed running larger dogs at Crissy Field East Beach. " Leashed/unleashed dogs in areas where dogs are prohibited, particularly Tennessee Valley Trail and Tennessee Beach. " Bagged and un-bagged, dog waste left on the beaches, trails, sidewalks, and lawns at all of the above areas. One of the worst areas is Oakwood Valley Trail where dog owners seem to mock the rules by consistently abandoning bagged feces along the trails

Organization:

Commenter: Lex F. and Bobbi Lynn Campbell and Jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3800 **Comment Id:** 359867 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I truly do not understand the desire to keep dogs away from recreational areas. Most owners are very conscientious and thoughtful about their pet's interactions with others enjoying the great out doors. I seldom see evidence of dog poop and almost never see irresponsible behavior by dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce B Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3841 **Comment Id:** 359969 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Urine and feces are damaging not just to the environment, but children are reluctant to get down on their hands and knees to explore when the area is soiled and smelly. And of course, what little wildlife there is, is scarcer and more skittish in areas where dogs are allowed - even in on-leash areas

Organization:

Commenter: N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3854 **Comment Id:** 359985 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a parent of two young children, and I cannot take my children to any of the local parks or on any of the Marin County trails because they are always full of off-leash dogs that are absolutely NOT under "voice control." The owners of these dogs are so blinded by the affection that they feel for their pets that they cannot seem to comprehend how children and their parents (or anyone other than themselves, for that matter) might see the dogs as a potential nuisance or threat. My children are understandably terrified when one strange dog after another comes bounding wildly toward them on the trails, their owners far behind and nowhere in sight.

Organization:

Commenter: Spencer N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3933 **Comment Id:** 360079 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the course of this progression, dogs numbers have also increased. I am in this area enough to see if the increase has posed a problem. I do not see a problem. Certainly some dog owners need to be reminded of dog etiquette such as cleaning up after a pet, training a pet not to jump on someone (especially children), or simply being mindful of their animal at all times. This can all be done with increased educational signage that helps to remind those few that need reminding

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah M Cardenas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3947 **Comment Id:** 360111 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The dogs run ragged all over the place and have a negative impact on the place and its quieter and less rambunctious citizens.

Organization: Audubon Society

Commenter: Kathryn K Spence **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3968 **Comment Id:** 360273 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Baquiano trail near Sweeny Ridge - Off Leash dog and owner jogging by my girlfriend and I. He kept running by, but the dog stopped to bark and snarl. I put Sandra behind me and yelled. The Dog owner came back, grabbed his dog by the collar, then berated US! Like we wanted to get attacked!

Organization:

Commenter: Mike C **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3971 **Comment Id:** 360305 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In 12 years of running our hound at Muir Beach I have never witnessed any dog there doing any harm to the environment or wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: richard Schaper **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4041 **Comment Id:** 360318 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We love Crissy Field. Sam our yellow lab is at his best when he is there. We went today on Valentines day and got to walk, throw the ball and connect with nature. It is so important to have nature avaliable to all, including dogs, in the heart of the city. It erased the boringness of a long work week. I go back feeling like I have had a trip to the mountains or been. My connection to nature is what keeps me healthy and also Sam our yellow lab. As a retired couple Sam is our constant companion and to be able to go to Crissy Field is the best. I go home feeling like I have been to th mountaina on a long vacation. Please do not close it off. The bikes cause more troubles then the dogs. Please do not take away our wonderful closeness to nature, our ability to find pleasure without a long drive. If you are reading this inside, go out and look around anad when you go back inside see if you don't feel better, Or pet a dog and you will feel better.

Organization:

Commenter: elaine anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4004 **Comment Id:** 360444 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I hike in Headlands above Marin city now. It is covered in dog poop. dogs are all off leash, running and jumping on hikers. the owners think it is cute when they flush baby quail out of the brush or chase after wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: Gail Thames **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4539 **Comment Id:** 360494 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I urge you to reconsider your current plan in regards to constraining dog use in the GGNRA. Please do not sacrifice the joys and needs of mans best friend. The land currently provided dogs in the GGNRA not only provides much needed space, play and comfort to many dogs; it gives a wonderful place for their owners to come and relax with their pets, exercise and experience many beautiful areas they might otherwise never see. I hope you can find an alternative to the current plan that does not sacrifice the happiness of so many.

Organization:

Commenter: Nathan L Hanley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4544 **Comment Id:** 360501 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We especially enjoy being able to let him off leash. He is so happy to run and interact with other dogs at the beach, that it brings joy to our hearts and helps to relieve the stresses of living and working in a city. We regard this as one of our favorite parts of living in San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeffrey J Cole **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4056 **Comment Id:** 360504 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In an ideal park experience, a park visitor wouldn't need to hear, see, or interact with dogs at all. Dogs have ruined my experience so much that I stopped visiting San Francisco city parks. Now the dog bullies want to complete their exclusion of the rest of us from the GGNRA. They've already succeeded to a large extent.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4545 **Comment Id:** 360518 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The joy that I get from being able to get outside and walk and play with my dog off leash is indescribable. My dog is the reason for me to get exercise, to meet other people and to love the fact that I live in San Francisco. Please do not take that away from me, my dog, and all the other dog owners in our beautiful city.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine Segalas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4549 **Comment Id:** 360557 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Unfortunately, the attitude of many of these dog owners is that their dog is entitled to use public space just as people are, but I have witnessed non-service dogs biting children, dogs peeing on personal belongings, running through fenced children's playgrounds and on public transportation. I even see off-leash, non-service dogs in grocery stores.

Organization:

Commenter: Rachel Holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4549 **Comment Id:** 360569 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Last month, a very large labrador approached my two sons who were strapped into their stroller while we were walking down a very busy section of FIllmore Street. It shoved its nose in my son's face. My son pushed him away. This dog was off-leash and the owner

casually said "he's friendly." No matter how friendly, dog owners cannot always predict their own dog's reaction, nor can they predict the reaction of a startled toddler who has just been accosted by an uninvited large dog. Prior to that, my 2 year old son has been knocked over by large dogs running off-leash in Julius Khan Park and again INSIDE the gated playground in Alta Plaza Park.

Organization:

Commenter: Rachel Holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4556 **Comment Id:** 360606 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I was at Crissy Field today with my dog enjoying the early morning with other families their dogs as well as families without dogs and individuals without dogs and it was a great experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Ling Chang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4557 **Comment Id:** 360607 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I would like to voice my opposition to your dog management plan. I live in Sonoma and I am handicapped. My well behaved labrador retriever and I regularly drive down to Crissy Field because he loves that beach. It is the only place where I can park myself in my wheel chair and throw the ball for my dog so he gets some exercise and I can sit back and watch him play with the other dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicholas Choulos **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4559 **Comment Id:** 360612 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I often walk along the beach at the GGNRA/Fort Funston as well as along the path adjacent to the batteries. I have never observed anything except both people from all walks of life enjoying the day as well as many happy dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Howard Page **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4574 **Comment Id:** 360665 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am compelled to comment on the SEIS because of yet another poor visitor experience due to unruly dogs during my recent visit to Fort Funston, Lands End, Surtro Heights Park, Crissy Field and Ft Mason for a geology class. Like other visits to GGNRA, this one was no different in terms of witnessing dogs eliminating themselves all over the park. I was surprised to observe many owners leaving their dog's solid waste behind in its raw form or packaged inside

a doggie bag. I witnessed a person walking thru the Crissy Field fenced wildlife area with their leashed dog, despite the signage stating this type of activity is not permitted. I watched unleashed and leashed dogs lunging and jumping at strangers, who did not request, nor welcome, this type of behavior. I have witnessed this type of owner/dog behavior on many prior visits to GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: susan rowinski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4585 **Comment Id:** 360678 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I like dogs and I know most owners are responsible, but I'm so tired of unleashed dogs running up to my three-year-old child, knocking her over or scaring her. People should take priority over dogs. Thank you for making the parks safer for all of us by implementing these reasonable restrictions dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4602 **Comment Id:** 361128 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am all for any and all dog bands! Every single time I've gone camping up in Marin Headlands people are walking there dogs where they shouldn't be. Scaring wild life, leaving feces and diseases for wild life to be infected with. Twice a dog walker let here dogs just start running around my campsite nosing in my tent and food. We need to do everything we can to lessen the canines impact in fragile areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Webster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4611 **Comment Id:** 361135 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my experience, I have not seen dogs fight with each other. I see happy dogs that run to their heart's content until they are tired. I see people enjoying each other as they share things about their animals. I have a history of depression. Dogs provide unconditional love when I see dogs running free, I feel peace, contentment, and joy. The interaction between humans and their animals projects happiness.

Organization:

Commenter: Virginia M Currie **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4618 **Comment Id:** 361138 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I know people that don't Even have dogs go to Chrissy Field and the other national Park areas to just watch the dogs joyfully run around. How could we even consider removing this From our fine city by the bay.

Organization:
Commenter: Lindsay A Hutchins **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4652 **Comment Id:** 361183 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Coming from a parent with a 4 year old that is Terrified of dogs and a family that spends weekends hiking in our great parks, I can tell you that off leash dogs are a problem for my child. He no longer likes to go on hikes with us since there are dogs that "chase" him when he runs from them.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A Kenworthy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4660 **Comment Id:** 361286 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Often, when I am trying to bird watch, dogs will run up to me,circle, bark, jump up or nuzzle me between the legs. Dog owners do not have their dogs under voice control and often are apologetic or just use the excuse that it's only a puppy. This is very distracting and often frieghtening to me not to mention scaring all the birds away.
Organization:
Commenter: Ralph V Pericoli **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4683 **Comment Id:** 361321 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Regarding the plans for Fort Mason, I would like to lend my support for alternative D. Alternative D offers a compromise that allows for the use of Fort Mason by different stakeholders. The Great Meadow is often too busy to allow for dogs to roam freely. While the rules require owners to pick up after their dogs, I have seen far too many cases of dogs defecating on the lawn (which I am sure the owner would attribute to the fact that they weren't watching their dog and the dog went to the bathroom without their knowledge). I shouldn't have to constantly look down when I walk thru an area. If dog owners want an area to allow the dogs off leash, they can use the Laguna Green area for that type of activity.
Organization:
Commenter: Matthew Jennings **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4684 **Comment Id:** 361322 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I support restrictions on dogs in the park. I strongly support enforcement of all dog restriction policies. Currently, our parks are dominated by dogs. Any walk in a San Francisco park involves numerous, non-stop, dog-related frustrations, including dogs jumping on you, dog waste underfoot, and plants destroyed by dogs.
Organization:

Commenter: Kimberly jannarone **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4687 **Comment Id:** 361327 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I regularly (between 4 and 6 times per week) walk my dog at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Baker beach and enjoy the recreation that it provides me, my family and my dog. I support the 'No action' alternative for these areas. Please enforce the existing rules of the 1979 Pet Policy.
Organization:
Commenter: David C Heughan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4688 **Comment Id:** 361333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I believe dogs should be allowed off leash and under voice control on certain areas of the beaches and on some of the trails. Dogs are a part of nature themselves. They are not only pets, but wonderful, happy creatures who love to run free in the wind and surf. I have noticed that not only their owners, but others on the beaches enjoy watching them play.
Organization:
Commenter: Marilyn O'Rourke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4689 **Comment Id:** 361336 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing to strongly opposed the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I am a dog owner in San Francisco and the GGNRA parks have been fundamental to me being able to raise a happy healthy pet. There's nothing that brings me as much joy as seeing my dog get excited as he smells Chrissy Field's beach air.
Organization:
Commenter: Siobhan Quinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4707 **Comment Id:** 361360 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Whenever I take my son or go with my friends (who also do not have any dogs) to a park in the city, there always seem to be dogs running around off leash, leaving their mess in areas where people would like to sit. They ruin the area for the taxpayers without animals.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4708 **Comment Id:** 361363 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: i have had dogs for my whole life. they are the closest thing to children i will

ever have. they are well behaved and always under voice control. i have spent alot of time with them in the beautiful nature around the bay area and i have never had any problems with any other dog owners or non dog owners in my 10 years of being here. this bill wil unfairly punish an entier section of society that does not deserve it.

Organization:

Commenter: whitney b leslie **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4712 **Comment Id:** 361370 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My 4 year old son was jumped in by loose dogs three time in Ft Funston during a trip to SF. One owner said maybe my son should go else where. Dogs can get good exercise on a leash without terrorizing kids. I have a dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian Mcbride **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4722 **Comment Id:** 361386 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs off leash on trails or running on beaches hurt wildlife and lessen the visitor experience. When I visit the trails and the beaches I yearn to experience the park in a natural state without dogs chasing wildlife and mauling children.

Organization:

Commenter: Kevin S Stockmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4110 **Comment Id:** 361446 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I enjoy quiet hikes to listen to birds and other natural sounds, to contemplate, to find some peace of mind. The intruding sounds of dogs barking or fighting, the harassment of strange dogs running up and jumping on me are distressing.

Organization: Audubon

Commenter: Corinne Louise Greenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4887 **Comment Id:** 361705 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My wife and I bring our dog to Crissy Field and Fort Mason regularly, and it is one of the few opportunities our dog has to really run and get the exercise he needs. This is a meaningful and valuable part of our lives in this city, and it is essential in keeping our dog happy and healthy. There is *no way* that we could get him the kind of exercise he needs on leash, and the dog parks, which are fine for daily use, are not a substitute for the kind of safe and vigorous exercise our dog Kid can get in more open spaces.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A T N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4893 **Comment Id:** 361711 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The highlight of our day is to walk on the beach and experience its power and beauty. There we exercise our bodies and minds. We share our walk with birds, people and other dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne M Herbst **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4904 **Comment Id:** 361752 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I walk my dog at Baker Beach (for example) almost every single morning. So I can tell you firsthand that the folks enjoying that beautiful stretch of land in the early morning consist only of (happy) people with their (happy) canine companions (and seasonal crab fishermen).
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4969 **Comment Id:** 361870 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: These areas create great places for dogs and people alike to walk and enjoy the fresh air. Walking a dog on a leash is no where near as pleasant for ether the dog or the human. I would be such a loss to have these great dog and human parks be turned into a space where dogs could not freely run.
Organization:
Commenter: Marlena R Donjacour **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4975 **Comment Id:** 361878 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My daily off leash walks with my dog enhance my quality of life in a way that is far superior to walking with the dog on a leash. I can walk at my pace and she can sniff and run at her pace. The level of stress relief is wonderful for both of us. Dogs interact with each other much more calmly off leash. They can actually play. Dog play, which is very important for the well-being of the dog and of tremendous enjoyment to their humans is not possible on leash.
Organization: Sierra Club
Commenter: Annemarie A Donjacour **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4983 **Comment Id:** 361890 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The presence of large numbers of hyperactive dogs is damaging to these

GGNRA160841

resources. They harass birds and trample plants. They interfere with other people's pleasure, making some areas unusable for large numbers of people.

Organization: California Native Plant Society Yerba Buena Chapter

Commenter: Jake Sigg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4998 **Comment Id:** 361904 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If there is no enforcement of dogs being off leash in specified leashed areas what point is all this? Every time I go for a walk/hike where dogs are supposed to be on a lease , there are dog owners who think that since there is no ranger giving them a ticket, it is OK to have their dogs off leash. Often I see folks with more than two dogs off lease, running in restricted areas, 40 Ft away from the owner. The owners cannot see what there dogs are doing and if they poo'ed the owners do not even know, or most times do not care. I've had dogs off lease run up to me and jump on me, and I am afraid of big dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahna Dominski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361910 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA proposal will severely impact my enjoyment of the beach, my home and my neighborhood.

Organization:

Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5031 **Comment Id:** 362024 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I support the preferred alternative and fencing of off leash areas. My park experiences have shown that dog owners do not follow leash and off leash restrictions. Just one example would be Limantour beach, where dog owners regularly do not follow off leash boundaries and let their dogs run freely along the beach. The trails down to the beach are filled with dog feces where owners do not pick up after their dogs. It was disgusting, and all the dogs on the beach does degrade my park experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Pete G Rowland **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5036 **Comment Id:** 362028 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not currently own a dog but often visit various parts of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. In my hundreds of visits to parks on both the North and South sides of Golden Gate Bridge, I cannot recall a time in which dog did anything but add to the experience.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5053 **Comment Id:** 362123 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I've had dogs run up and jump on me and the adults/children I am with which can be very scary too.
Organization:
Commenter: Sharon A Barnett **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5057 **Comment Id:** 362138 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have yet to see a single problem regarding interaction with dogs, humans, or wildlife, either on the trails or at Muir Beach where I take my dog once a week. For that reason I suggest that the GGNRA to retain its longstanding 1979 pet policy and take the "No Action Alternative" for the SEIS area in Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.
Organization:
Commenter: Sam McMillan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5069 **Comment Id:** 362152 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Regardless of the weather, I've always enjoyed the beach because all dogs big and small walk, run, and play with no leash in such an open space and I've never seen anyone having any issue with any dog in any way. The beach always reminded me how peaceful life can be where humans and animals can indeed coexist.
Organization:
Commenter: Tianyu Li **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5094 **Comment Id:** 362171 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I visit Fort Funston on a weekly basis with my dog Kato and I see how happy he is while playing there. Not only does he thrive while visiting the off leash areas, I benefit from it too.
Organization:
Commenter: David Yip **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5112 **Comment Id:** 362197 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When I visit GGNRA, I enjoy seeing the responsible dogs and owners that frequent these areas and take the time to get their dogs out for exercise and socialization. I have

had positive experiences with the pets and owners. These restrictive proposals would push too many dogs into neighborhood parks or limited on leash areas within the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4218 **Comment Id:** 362222 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am so sick of unleashed dogs and their irresponsible owners. I go for a daily walk either in the Bayview's shoreline parks or in San Francisco's Golden Gate Park; there isn't a day when I don't encounter an unleased dog in areas where signs are posted stating that dogs must be on leash. On a few occasions I've pointed out the signs to dog owners and have been subjected to verbal abuse or threatened with physical violence. I would love to see just one dog owner cited and fined for ignoring the leash laws. I've seen unleashed dogs digging, chasing wildlife, and leaving their mess behind...yes, I have recently stepped in dog poop on a trail with signs requesting dog owners to clean up after their dogs

Organization:

Commenter: Joyce A Gubelman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4224 **Comment Id:** 362229 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: On page 6 the SEIS reads that "... the park continued to receive an increasing number of complaints by park visitors, including minorities, seniors, and families with small children, alleging that off-leash dogs had prevented them from visiting the park for fear of being knocked over or attacked by dogs or verbally abused by dog owners," The actual number of complaints starts from a small base and the change may be correlated with the population increase. This conclusion is clearly overstated based on my 20 years of personal experience of walking these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: G K Webb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5152 **Comment Id:** 362285 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having direct access to the beach and the permitted trails increases my quality of life because I get to exercise myself and my dogs in this beautiful environment. In addition, my dogs go to Fort Funston almost every weekday with their dogwalker while I am at work, which gives me peace of mind because their need for physical activity is fulfilled.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5153 **Comment Id:** 362288 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I know that many dog owners feel that being able to have their dogs off leash everywhere in the GGNRA should be sacrosanct. However, there are other users of the park who do not want to encounter loose dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Linda M Morgan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4239 **Comment Id:** 362310 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA incident reports show that it isn't the dogs causing the problems.
Organization:
Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4260 **Comment Id:** 362329 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who don't want to be around dogs. It ignores the fact that right now these people can easily go to areas where dogs are not allowed. The plan neglects to discuss a visitor experience in which people want to be around dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Joanne A Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4268 **Comment Id:** 362341 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: From when I was a teenager (44yrs ago), to the present, I have frequented Stinson Beach. I love to walk the beach with my dog, Angel. She is my companion since my husband died of ALS. We go to the dogs allowed, north side of the beach. Anyhow I just want to express my love of going to the Beach with my dog, and dogs of the past. Many, many wonderful memories, and hopefully future walks with my dog and friends.
Organization:
Commenter: kathleen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5177 **Comment Id:** 362451 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I live by 8th ave and Balbao ave in Inner Richmond and am 2 blocks from Golden Gate Park, where I frequent on a daily basis with my pet where I either a) run through the park with him, as well as play Frisbee/fetch. Not only do I get great exercise for both myself and my dog, but this is usually one of the highlights of my day.
Organization:
Commenter: Angeline Yap **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5181 **Comment Id:** 362502 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not everybody likes dogs or animals and everybody has a right to utilize public lands without infringement or disturbance of a dog or animal sniffing, barking, running up, digging up, chasing the wildlife, or leaving fecal or urine matter and residual smells upon areas that are for the preservation of our future generations.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5187 **Comment Id:** 362533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We don't go to those places looking for a wilderness experience, we go for a recreational experience based on access to the ocean, the beach, the stands of eucalyptus, and the paved walking paths, public toilets, food concessions, and easy parking.

Organization: Individual

Commenter: Kevin J Owens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5211 **Comment Id:** 362615 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: One of our favorite family pastimes is walking down to Ocean Beach and running our dog. He gets to run full speed through the surf, fetch the ball and play with his friends. How sad we would all be to have this taken away! Please reconsider your ban

Organization:

Commenter: Ymke Dioquino **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5231 **Comment Id:** 362736 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the parts of the walk closest to parking, there appeared to be many commercial dog-walkers, almost all of whom had 6 dogs, so that, in the vicinity of many of these groups of dogs, especially along the water, the barking was so loud, it was like being in a kennel. This racket was not at all what I was looking for when I took this walk.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Sprinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5231 **Comment Id:** 362741 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What this analysis seems to miss is the effects of dogs on other people who are drawn to these areas for peace and quiet, to take in the incredible vistas, to watch birds, and to commune with nature. For example, if there's a bird or birds in the vicinity of a dog or group of dogs, the latter are often chasing the former, which is a hardly what you're after if you come to the park in order to observe birds and other wildlife in nature.

Organization:
Commenter: Joan Sprinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5239 **Comment Id:** 362757 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Moreover, personally, the presence of dogs completely destroys my ability to enjoy the potential beauty and serenity that I seek in the GGNRA. I frequently walk and hike at Lands End, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Crissy Field, and other areas within the GGNRA. I am never able to enjoy any of these walks and hikes for long, because I always encounter dogs, very frequently off leash. No matter how prominent the signs are stating dogs can be on leash only, there are always people who let their dogs off leash. I have never taken a hike or walk anywhere within the GGNRA in which I didn't encounter off leash dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5239 **Comment Id:** 362758 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Because of the presence of dogs, everyone is forced interact with them or to take in their behavior as part of the environment. Dogs are dogs, and they always interact with other dogs, other animals, and humans. And often they bark, fight other dogs, sniff or approach people. Visitors to the GGNRA should not be forced to have these experiences.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5251 **Comment Id:** 362811 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have never seen a dog fight or any person be harmed by a dog. I have seen families, couples, and professional dog walkers, all enjoying the ocean and the trails. I have never seen a dog digging in the dunes or disturbing the birds nesting in the cliffs.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Nightingale **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5254 **Comment Id:** 362817 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have two dogs and have taken them to Funston and Crissy Field many times. Crissy Field in particular is their favorite place to go in the city. I've never had a bad experience taking my dogs to these places: the dogs, dog owners, and non-dog owners are respectful of each other and the environment. So in my opinion option A, preserving the status quo, is the best path forward.
Organization:
Commenter: Denis Serenyi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5270 **Comment Id:** 362847 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In general, characterization of dog-related issues in the SEIS is misleading. The SEIS document has failed to provide evidence that dog walking is resulting in conflicts and resource degradation. From 2008 through 2011, a total of 1,537 dog-related incidents associated with natural resources occurred at GGNRA according to Table 6 in the SEIS. However, out of a total of 1,537 dog-related incidents, there were only three incidents of dogs destroying vegetation. Meanwhile, there were only 15 dog-related incidents of dogs disturbing wildlife. 1,519 incidents were related to dogs being off-leash in on-leash areas or dogs being in closed areas-incidents that could be attributed to lack of public education and signage by GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine C Cowdery **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5284 **Comment Id:** 362874 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep these areas in and around San Francisco open to pets. The joy that I often feel as a dog owner, getting to see my dog run and play and exercise and just generally love life cannot be replaced

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Weber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5303 **Comment Id:** 362927 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am renewed and refreshed by the effort of walking in the dunes and on the beach, and I take an incredible joy in watching my terriers racing about like children at the playground. I know that every other dog owner there would share to some degree that sentiment.

Organization:

Commenter: Dan Kaljian **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5304 **Comment Id:** 362929 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: At Muir Beach, I would like to enjoy the beach without being surrounded by dogs. As it is now, I do not go to Muir Beach nearly as often as I would if dogs were more restricted on the beach. The dogs are barking, running fast and wild, and seem to outnumber human beings. There should be a large area at the beach where no dogs are allowed and people could rest, nap or picnic without staying on a constant vigilant watch for dogs running over their blankets or getting into their food, fighting, etc. I love the beach, and Muir Beach is the closest to my house but it seems so unfair that I just can't enjoy it without the never ending hyper activity of dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5304 **Comment Id:** 362933 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I've had dogs run full speed at me or at my children, and the owner ignoring me or arguing when I ask that they leash their dog. The more aggressive the breed, the more the person seems to argue. "My dog is friendly" they call as the pitbull is rushing at my child. If I politely ask them to put their dog on a leash while they pass us, the response is typically that their dog is harmless, and they would rather argue and defend their dog's character than to comply with the rule and my request.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5314 **Comment Id:** 362953 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash versus on leash makes a world of difference in terms of his happiness and and overall health.. He has very strong name recall and has been trained to stick by my side ever since he was a puppy. Training him properly allowed us both to have the quality of life that is far better than making a dog stay on leash or fenced in.
Organization:
Commenter: Tracey Gold **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5335 **Comment Id:** 362974 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Being able to take my dog to an area that allows them to run free and play with other dogs is not only fun for the dog, but fun for the owners. In my experience most dog owners are responsible and take pride in the environment. For those that aren't, education is key.
Organization:
Commenter: debi N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5346 **Comment Id:** 362992 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please don't further reduce the places dogs can go....this has gotten out of control in recent years. The rare occasions of problems don't justify this. I am not a dog owner, but am definitely a dog lover and truly enjoy seeing dogs when I go trail running or hiking
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah Rusby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5382 **Comment Id:** 363031 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: People have the right to take a walk in a national park without being concerned about a loose dog attacking them, or even coming up to sniff them, with a slobbery snout. People should be able to sit down without strange dogs swarming around them, and disturbing their peace.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane C Ramos **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5391 **Comment Id:** 363042 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many favorite trails are now overrun with off leash dogs that are not command responsive or may respond "sometimes". When chasing rabbits or squirrels or birds, commands are ignored by the majority of canines. These trails are no longer pleasant and instead intimidating, as one never knows when they will encounter an animal that is often wary and nervous. Dog fights on trails are not uncommon, likely due to nervous or territorial dogs.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon

Commenter: Leora Feeney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363175 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off-leash dogs at the GGNRA have harmed park visitors. Off-leash dogs have been involved in many dog fights and dog bites at the GGNRA. Off-leash dogs have been injured at the GGNRA falling off steep cliffs. Charging and growling off-leash dogs frighten visitors and hamper their ability to enjoy the GGNRA. Running dogs off-leash at the GGNRA puts the welfare of wildlife at great risk. Off-leash dogs are more likely to leave behind dog feces in the park, reducing the recreational value of the GGNRA

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5415 **Comment Id:** 363184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Just recently my family was hiking in Marin County when an off-leash dog ran up and began aggressively barking at my wife, with the dog owner nowhere in sight. My daughter, who is under two years old, was visibly shaken and brought to tears. By the time the owner approached, with claims that her dog "never acts like this", the day and hike were already ruined for my family. When I asked the owner to please keep her dog on a leash, she became hostile, and barked that she said she was sorry, what did I want from her. I simply said that she should keep her dog on a leash in this area, to which she gaffawed and walked off with her dog still off leash. My baby daughter could not be calmed, and we had to end our nature walk.

Organization:

Commenter: JOHN P Dumbacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5440 **Comment Id:** 363261 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is one of the greatest places and areas for me to exercise and my dog to do the same. its not only our 4 legged friends that get a good work out ever time we visit, Funston and Chrisy. We all benefit from these walks, we need these areas (and more of them) with easy access for all.

Organization: TBD

Commenter: Ursula McCurry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5446 **Comment Id:** 363288 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition to wildlife being harassed I have also witnessed people being harassed by dogs. Some people are very sensitive to animals and they do not appreciate it when dogs approach them or their kids. The percentage of dog owners who actually have "voice control" is very low.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363300 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Several times playing peacefully in the sand with my small children we had barking, angry dogs approach us, kick sand in our faces, destroy our sand castles, with us not knowing how far the attack would go.. bites? Each time the distant owner would do nothing- maybe lamely call the dogs name or look at us like we were the ones at fault for enjoying some quiet family time in a national treasure. Or even get angry at us! We often just went home disappointed and sad.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363304 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Just this morning a loud barking dog, audible from 1/2 mile away in both directions, ruining the peaceful morning.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5476 **Comment Id:** 363341 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a resident of San Francisco and an owner of two rescued dogs, I understand the desire to have spaces where my dogs can run and play, but I also recognize I have responsibility not to have my dogs not ruin the chance for others to enjoy those same spaces.

When family members complain that they are uncomfortable taking their small children to the beach at Crissy Field because they fear an unpleasant interaction with off leash dogs, I have to wonder if we as a society have our priorities correct.

Organization:

Commenter: James P Kren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5477 **Comment Id:** 363343 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The opportunity to experience them running free is one of the most liberating and profound relationships that man can share with animals.Ocean Beach is beautiful, and having our dogs run free enhances this experience. I have walked the entireOcean Beach nearly every day in the last 20 years, and our dogs running free completes this experience in the highest manner. PLease make all Ocean Beach off-leash

Organization:

Commenter: peter n munks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5488 **Comment Id:** 363352 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our dog is an integral part of our lives and we do our duty to keep her as healthy and happy as any possible - similar to any parent. Taking our dog to local recreation areas to run is the primary source for her health and happiness - as well as one of ours.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Palmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5588 **Comment Id:** 363973 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have been nothing but impressed with the way people interact with others. I've run into more inconsiderate people flying kites than I have dog owners in the GGNRA. In fact, there were fewer than 20 reported incidents involving dogs in the most recent data released.

Organization:

Commenter: Colleen A McNulty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5591 **Comment Id:** 363978 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Strolling Fort Funtson with mine and other dogs running off leash and enjoying nature is a wonderful thing. It would be a terrible shame for that to change.

Organization:

Commenter: Don Howerton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5606 **Comment Id:** 364000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm not a dog owner, but I'm not a dog hater, either. But at Crissy Field and Ocean Beach, the off-leash dogs can be a nuisance. I cannot walk without off-leash dogs rushing up to me, or having to listen to owners shouting at their off-leash dogs to obey them. I came out to enjoy the scenery and to watch for birds, not to have to dodge dogs. Moreover, it isn't possible to bring a very small dog or a small child to these places due to the number of large dogs off leash: the owner may think the dog is friendly, but the rest of us have to take precautions with the safety of a small child or small dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen A Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5632 **Comment Id:** 364048 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs frighten off wildlife in the park. They chase birds. They are the only park 'visitors' that routinely defecate and urinate in the park. They bite people! Children who are at face level with most of the dogs in the park are at risk from dog attacks while playing in the park. Dogs bark. The tranquility of a day in the park is disturbed by the presence of dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: georgina j monahan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5647 **Comment Id:** 364067 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The owners/dog walkers and the dogs are well behaved, well socialized and not intimidating.

Organization:

Commenter: Catherine Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5648 **Comment Id:** 364068 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Voice control" is a euphemism for "no control" and unless GGNRA has insufficient funding to provide ranger services during the day, these abuses will continue. Currently, there are typically no rangers present even on popular beaches on sunny weekend days - this past weekend on Rodeo Beach, for example, between 10 and 1 pm, not a ranger seen, and many loose dogs running roughshod over sunbathers, picnickers, and small children. When conftonted dog owners are hostile and argumentative and deny any responsibility for their animals' behavior. I have been told at Crissy Field that this is a "dog beach" and children are not welcome (my son was trampled to the point of screaming because a dog wanted his sandwich).

Organization:

Commenter: Liza Wozniak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5664 **Comment Id:** 364094 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The off leash dog community has a long history of ignoring rules designed to protect the general public from their uncontrolled dogs. The concept of "voice control" is completely without merit in the context of off leash recreation in public parks. Not only is it irritating to have to listen to owners shouting at their dogs, the lack of formal training in most dogs makes the efforts ineffective as well.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5727 **Comment Id:** 364189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Owning a dog builds community- it gets you outside every single morning and evening to see your neighbors who would otherwise only pass in cars or live behind closed doors. It leads to a healthier community, encouraging each other to stay active. But nothing compares to the joy of seeing a dog happily running in his element, joy that is absolutely contagious and makes our community a better place to live.

Organization:

Commenter: Beth L **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5760 **Comment Id:** 364257 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have NEVER owned a dog, and yet LOVE that they are all over- - playing and enjoying themselves. It seems absolutely absurd to deprive the animals, as well as their owners, of the freedom and camaraderie they experience. Even those of us who don't have dogs, enjoy seeing them run around and watching others playing with them.

Organization:

Commenter: Elisa Bigelow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5776 **Comment Id:** 364284 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have always felt that dogs off leash, even if responsive to vocal control, have been a problem. I have witnessed them chasing shorebirds and approaching stranded marine mammals so many times I can't even count. I am the owner of a small dog who is always on leash and has been rushed up on by larger dogs off leash, which frighten both of us.

Organization:

Commenter: S L P **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5788 **Comment Id:** 364302 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is nothing, and I mean nothing, more enjoyable to our exceptionally friendly 8 year old Corgi (and few things more enjoyable to us, her people) than cavorting in the

surf with a tennis ball at the 'dog approved' area of north Stinson Beach. She loves to say hello to people and, of course, go get that ball. And it really is the highpoint of her existence. Please, please, please don't take that away from her. And from us.

Organization:

Commenter: Josh Lebowitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5797 **Comment Id:** 364322 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our lives have been enriched by the community of friends we have made there - friends from all social, economic and ethnic backgrounds, people we would never have met otherwise. Our dogs have always been active and the too small city dog parks do not afford them or us the opportunity for enough exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5800 **Comment Id:** 364327 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a member of the GGNPC and the Sierra Club I am disappointed to read that off leash areas will be further reswtricted in the Recreation Area. It seems that the burden should be on the Park Service to explain why restrictons must be imposed after decades of use by dog owners and their companions. When I visit the area beaches in particular, I am always happy to see dogs and their owners enjoying themselves and that is one of the attractions of the area for me.

Organization:

Commenter: Vincent Domeraski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5802 **Comment Id:** 364330 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, I believe that the vast number of people who use these areas for recreation enjoy the fact that individual and families with dogs also populate them, and that the number of people who would seek to restrict or limit these areas to dogs is very small, and not representative of the majority point of view.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane M Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5803 **Comment Id:** 364333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I also visit areas, without a dog, just to enjoy the dogs playing. I frequent Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Mori Point and other areas. The exercise I gain from these walks is not obtainable in the vastly smaller space of my local city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael B Goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5837 **Comment Id:** 364377 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I visit Fort Funston at least a few times per year with my 4 kids and two dogs. We have limited options in our area to enjoy a beach walk this way and never have seen any issues with dogs are people. I strongly encourage the GGNRA to maintain its current policy regarding dogs and let us continue to enjoy this benefit.
Organization:
Commenter: Jason Berry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5848 **Comment Id:** 364398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a father of two young boys living in the city, I get very frustrated by how a city of people is over run by dog owners and dogs who have abused the lack of signage to allow all sized dogs to run free without a leash. Many times a week when one approaches my kids, I am told 'he is friendly'. That doesn't matter to me...maybe my 1 year old isn't friendly because he hasn't spent a lot of time with an 80 lb lab and will poke him in the eye because the dog is pushing his mouth in my sons face; and who knows how friendly that un leashed dog will then be? I have been biten and harassed by all kinds of "friendly" dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Ben holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5856 **Comment Id:** 364421 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Recently, however I have witnessed something like dog anarchy at Crissy Field and at Fort Funston, and seen trails blocked by the professional dog-walkers with packs of a dozen or more dogs. I have seen unsanitary, smelly waste left by a few irresponsible owners. I even talked with a neighbor who had a dog jump on her back while she was jogging in Fort Funston, only to have the owner blame her for the attack because she was running!
Organization:
Commenter: James R Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5874 **Comment Id:** 364438 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have two dogs of my own who love to play outside. Having areas for dogs offleash means that not only do I get to enjoy my walks but so do my dogs. They get to socialize which also keeps dogs from getting violent.
Organization:
Commenter: Shirlee Ezra **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5876 **Comment Id:** 364441 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Having offleash dog areas is great for me and for my dogs to socialize. It gives us the ability to get away from home with the dogs and not have to have them attached to our sides at every single moment. Dont reduce the offleash dog friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: RoseMarie A Ezra **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5896 **Comment Id:** 364492 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: You know, everything really is fine the way it is, in regards to dogs, children and adults enjoying open spaces together. Of course you will get individual dog haters and their personal unfounded fears of violence and dirt that they project onto dogs and their owners, but the vast majority do not have any complaint, and you won't hear from them.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Wickler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5903 **Comment Id:** 364508 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The vast majority of GGNRA users and their dogs are well behaved. In 9 years of using the park (usually the Rodeo area) on a weekly basis, I have NEVER had a bad experience with any dog or human.
Organization:
Commenter: Joseph Hughes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5931 **Comment Id:** 364671 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have been negatively impacted by off leash dogs almost every time I go to GGNRA beaches and parks. Areas are fouled by dog waste - - regardless of signs and bags being provided. People do not take responsibility to manage their pet or follow existing leash restrictions. I love dogs and appreciate the desire of owners to have an off leash experience - - however that experience should not be at the detriment of others or diminish my rights to safely enjoy the area.
Organization:
Commenter: Norman E Torello **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5938 **Comment Id:** 364676 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would like to voice my support of restrictions on off leash dogs in the GGNRA. Habitat degradation, the stressing of wild life, the trampling of restored areas and numerous incidents of having off leash dogs jumping on or barking at me has curtailed my

enjoyment of this national park.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert M Cullison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5956 **Comment Id:** 364784 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: please do not change the leash laws at Crissy Field. We very much enjoy it as one of the few places in the City/County of San Francisco where we can RFID the family and let her run free under the understanding that we are responsible for watching her and picking up after her. I have not experienced the off leash dogs as interfering with non-dog owning patons of the park in any significant way.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Ketter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5959 **Comment Id:** 364809 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the dog management plan the issue of off leash is presented as "off leash dog walking". Off leash dog hiking better represents the issue from the viewpoint of many off leash proponents. Hiking is a form of human recreation; a hike is generally recognized as taking place over a distance on unpaved trails and through varied terrine. That's what I do in the Rancho. Hiking with one's dog off leash is an excellent form of recreation with the great benefit to the human. Walking the dog connotes a benefit for the dog. Hiking is a human activity I value. Hiking with my dog adds to my pleasure as well as my sense of safety. I urge GGNA to preserve this form of recreation within the newly acquired Rancho Corral de Tierra property in San Mateo.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Glines **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5963 **Comment Id:** 364820 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I support all forms of stronger control of dogs. Dogs interfere with wildlife in all parks, and interfere with me when I picnic, bicycle, and jog. Dogs owners delegation of walking to professionals makes bicycling difficult. I am often confronted with a trail full of unleashed dogs, left right and center. I am concerned about the effect of dogs on wildlife, such as bobcats and birds.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5965 **Comment Id:** 364821 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a senior diagnosed with osteoporosis, I am constantly fearful of being

knocked over by dogs running at large in areas where they are supposed to be leashed or are not allowed at all. So many of my favorite beaches and parklands are now areas I am forced to avoid due to the impacts of dogs off-leash. I fully understand why people like to run their dogs off-leash but it should not be at the expense of other parkland and beach users.

Organization:

Commenter: Gill M Greensite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5969 **Comment Id:** 364831 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I've never encountered any hostile or destructive dogs, though I accept they must exist. As do hostile humans, and other predatory wildlife - they can all be controlled via existing enforcement mechanisms.

Organization:

Commenter: Gillian Manning **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5989 **Comment Id:** 364867 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to opose any changes to the laws surrounding off leash rules at the park. Dog and owners activate and use the parks to their fullest. I have never heard anyone complain that they don't use a park because it has dogs. Actually I heard the opposite where like children people enjoy the activity of seeing dogs and children.

Organization:

Commenter: Collin Burry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5991 **Comment Id:** 364869 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: have been going to Fort Funston almost weekly ever since we got our dog, and it is the happiest we ever see him. It is great for all the dogs to run free, and play and swim, and we have never had a bad experience with other dogs, or witnessed a bad person/dog interaction.

Organization:

Commenter: Chris Finegold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6040 **Comment Id:** 365019 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my time as a Dog Walker I've NEVER had a problem with another dog or their walker, in fact just the opposite - I feel overall we police the area ourselves very well & in no way do I feel $2,000,000 should be used in support of more rangers. There are certainly many other areas that would benefit from those funds like MORE parking!

Organization:

Commenter: hannah j st. martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4418 **Comment Id:** 365163 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I have walked my dogs at Fort Funston since 1996. I am able to walk up and down the cliffs and pass folks half my age because of the exercise I get at the beach with my dog. Fort Funston has been my sanctuary'I worked for almost 15 years at Hospice By the Bay as their Bereavement Coordinator until the middle of last year. The three days I walked per week helped me stay present for others in their grief process. I now walk almost every morning with my new dog. The sense of community is very strong, as well as the sense of taking care of the land. It is a place where women can walk alone and feel safe. It is a sacred space for many people and their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Carol Schlesinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6055 **Comment Id:** 365265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have watched countless moments when handicapped people, children, other pets, as well as birds, are frightened by roving off-leash dogs. I also watch the degradation of the ground and ground cover by uncontrolled dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Eugenie Marek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6056 **Comment Id:** 365271 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a user of the GGNRA prior to having a dog, I never felt a conflict or observed any conflict with different stakeholders. I personally hope you will find that off leash dog areas are sustainable and acceptable in most of the areas that currently permit off leash activities.

Organization:

Commenter: Sienna Rogers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6076 **Comment Id:** 365328 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Every outing now involves being run at by unrestrained dogs. While these animals may have friendly intentions, that is not enough to ensure the safety of other users. I won't walk my own dog on leash there anymore - having been charged, attacked, and bitten by a loose dog (in another area), he doesn't like unrestrained dogs running up to him. While on horseback, I have been confronted by multiple loose, unfriendly dogs, with no owner in sight or earshot of my calls for help. I have also been verbally abused for asking people to stop their dog running around my horse's feet - despite my expressed concern for the safety of their dog!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6100 **Comment Id:** 365410 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a dog owner we need designated locations to take our dogs for them to run off leash to properly exercise and experience the outdoors. It is in these moments as a dog owner when my dog and I are able to run free in open space that I most enjoy GGNRA properties.
Organization:
Commenter: Krista N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6113 **Comment Id:** 365431 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When we are out walking, I see that most other non dog owners react favorably to having dogs off leash. The vast majority of dogs stay close to their owners and behave themselves. Most dog owners are very attached to their animals, care for them & clean up after them.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Schoen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6114 **Comment Id:** 365436 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I find it impossible to have a pleasant walk because of the many many many dogs running loose. Their owners stand around with their cell phones, talk with each other, throw things for the dogs to chase, but the owners DO NOT mind their pets. I love dogs. I grew up with beloved pets. However, I feel that I should have as much right to go for a walk on the beach or in a park as someone's dog. I do not. There are too many dogs and they are running loose. Even on park areas where there is supposed to be a leash rule, no one keeps a dog on a leash. Seriously, in the past at least ten years I think I have seen two dogs on leash, and they may have been about to be set loose or may have been just recalled and leashed.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie J Friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6114 **Comment Id:** 365441 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am so tired of having to tip toe around the edges of the beach or park so that I am not in the way of the dogs. I do not enjoy seeing them urinate on the beach and the delicate plants. I do not enjoy seeing them defecate and then wondering if the owner will stop talking long enough to clean up. Nine times out of ten, they do not.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie J Friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6115 **Comment Id:** 365447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: just this Saturday, I was hiking on a "leashed" trail, the Cataract Trail, and there were 4 dogs off leash
Organization:
Commenter: Matt Richardson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6115 **Comment Id:** 365451 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm tired of seeing the green, black, or blue dog poops bags that owners have left on the ground. I've found those bags on my street in SF, in the Marin headlands, on Ocean Beach, at the trails by Ocean beach.
Organization:
Commenter: Matt Richardson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6115 **Comment Id:** 365452 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When I go to our shared public / NPS land, I don't want to be interrupted by someone else's dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Matt Richardson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6305 **Comment Id:** 365455 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: NPS fails to even acknowledge that the beaches are empty most of the time, even on the weekends when the weather is cool.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa P Carey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6122 **Comment Id:** 365485 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Over the years, I have been surprised, even shocked, by the number of off-leash dogs. If I were a dog owner, I would certainly want to have places where I can walk and exercise my dog. But the park is for many users, some of whom want to enjoy a dog-free area as much as they want to be free to roam in open space free of buildings and cars
Organization:
Commenter: Judith Dunham **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6318 **Comment Id:** 365510 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The review of ethnic responses showed an equality in positive response in ethnic responses when looking at the categories that support somewhat or strongly. I would think this would be a selling point. But that format of randomly calling people for a sampling of the population might be more effective in another subject matter. One should survey park users, not people who may never go or who many never have been so their response to the experience seems irrelevant. The 71% rpresents people who go to and use the parks and who will be affected the most by these restrictions. Their voices should matter.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6132 **Comment Id:** 365543 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am so sick of having to deal with dogs on the beach. It is a public beach that is overrun by so many dogs it makes it difficult to enjoy it. My husband will not walk with me there because he dislikes contending with all the dogs. I really support the restrictions on dogs on this beach so that the birds can have their habitat, and the beach will be a peaceful place for humans to enjoy again.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6153 **Comment Id:** 365644 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not 1 horse rider I have ever spoken with(dozens over the years) have voiced opposition to allowing leashed dogs on these trails. In fact, I'd venture a guess that at least 75% o equestrians have their dogs with them when riding from the stables area.

Organization:

Commenter: jim d sullivan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6171 **Comment Id:** 365740 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What in the world is the point in banning off-leash dog areas? Simply ludacris. I am sure other's can be far more eloquent on the topic. For me, it's absolute bullcrap. Designated space for human's and their dogs in no way-shape-or-form hinders those who, for whatever ridiculous reason other than allergies, do not have a dog from anything.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher P Flick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6353 **Comment Id:** 365791 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: FORT FUNSTON This entire site is one giant dog park, rendering it inaccessible to regular visitors hoping to take a walk without being harassed by dogs. At present,

there are way too many dog owners with enormous numbers of dogs - more than they can reasonably be expected to control. While attempting to walk there recently, I was nearly knocked to the ground by two dogs leased together. Once their owner - who was off trying to corral other dogs- noticed, she acted like it was my fault the dogs were inconvenienced. Sounds like an exaggeration, but it isn't. I've felt threatened there by unruly dogs whose shouting owners seemed oblivious to anyone's experience other than their own. Voice control doesn't work; in addition why should anyone have to listen to scores of owners shouting at multiple dogs anyway? One dog owner recently voiced a doubt I had a right to be at the park without a dog, putting into words the reality - Ft Funston has been degraded into one enormous dog park, there is no room for non dog owners at this public recreation area.

Organization:

Commenter: withheld for privacy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6358 **Comment Id:** 365797 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The reports of dog-related violations in the Draft Dog Management Plan are not broken down as to types of incidents; it is quite likely that a large portion of those reported are merely leash-law violations and the like. The failure of GGNRA to include such a breakdown to allow discernment of this type itself should cause great concern regarding the fairness and accuracy of the report/ plan.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6388 **Comment Id:** 365822 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I feel that dogs in natural areas, especially when off-leash, can interfere with others' enjoyment; I have experienced this first-hand as a casual ornithologist and naturalist. The impacts have ranged from unattended dog waste (bagged or unbagged); excessive digging to disturb the natural profile of the beach; dog bites; and wildlife harassment in the form of waterbird chasing (a common phenomenon at Ocean Beach).

Organization:

Commenter: Steve Phillips **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366023 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Currently, the Preferred Alternatives only provide a few areas where visitors, including those with small children, may go without having to interact with dogs. This is not fair to community members that have a right to enjoy the park without fear or discomfort due to the presence of dogs. While dog walking provides many benefits for dog owners, including socialization and exercise, it can act as a barrier to physical activities and park enjoyment for non-dog owners. For many, the presence of dogs and dog waste negative affects their park experience and acts a barrier to using and enjoying the park.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366025 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute (CFLR) published a summary of the Toohey (2011) and McCormack (2010) studies and summarized impacts to non-dog owners due to dog activity in urban parks to include: â€¢ Dogs are often perceived as a nuisance, due to dog waste, litter and disturbance; â€¢ Uncontrolled dogs create perceptions of risks to public safety; and â€¢ Older adults, women, and ethnic minorities are more likely to perceive dogs as barriers to physical activity than other groups. o Women who perceived off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods had 50 minutes less of physical activity than women in neighborhoods who did not observe off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods; and o Latino women perceived off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods or parks as barriers to letting their children play outside. These perceptions creat barriers to outdoor physical activity for many. The SEIS fails to adequately emphasize the disenfranchisement or loss of activity to many in the community due to the status quo of dog-related recreation in the GGNRA.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366028 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Moreover, GGAS' members have repeated informed us about negative interactions with dogs and dog owners in parts of the GGNRA, typically because an off-leash dog has charged one of our members (on occasion, resulting in a bite) or charged wildlife. Members report avoiding areas they once visited, including Ft. Funston (once a great spot for birding), and Ocean Beach (one member stated she will no longer take her grandchildren there for fear of off-leash dogs and the presence of dog feces in the sand). Our members' experiences are borne out in the hundreds of Criminal Incident Reports that were cited in our May 2011 letter (attached hereto and incorporated by reference).
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6391 **Comment Id:** 366067 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS suggests that dogs are the main driver of complaints by visitors. Complaints about the smell of urine around the batteries of Fort Funston have no evidence that those smells are coming from dog urine. In my many visits to Fort Funston and the Marin Headlands (Battery Rathbone), there has been the smell of urine around old batteries. There have also been beer cans and cigarette butts in the area. I find it much more likely that the smell of urine is from human urine rather than dog urine, especially as there are dramatically fewer dogs at Battery Rathbone than at Fort Funston.

Organization:
Commenter: Jeffrey A Ubersax **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366081 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Second, dog-related recreation has clear and negative impacts for park visitors. As discussed further below, the presence of dogs-especially off-leash dogs-acts as a barrier for many visitors to using and enjoying the parks. As an organization concerned about getting as many Bay Area residents outside and enjoying the natural beauty of our environment, GGAS must concern itself with these issues of access.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6215 **Comment Id:** 366133 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Limiting access for dogs would also limit access for so many dog owners. For so many people dogs are a huge and enriching part of our lives. Dogs do so much for people with disabilities, people who may suffer from depression, people that may otherwie not make it out of their houses and into the parks. Dogs help people feel connected and can easy anxity. walking dogs daily can have great health benifits for dog owners. My dog has got me through some pretty rough times. Enjoying our parks is one of my favorite past times and is an enriching experience and great luxury that I do not want to loose.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6229 **Comment Id:** 366147 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have never seen (and I can't even remember hearing) of any problems caused by the presence of dogs on or off-leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Jay Kammen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6230 **Comment Id:** 366150 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a resident of San Francisco and have been going to Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and Baker Beach on a weekly basis for the last 10 years because I can walk my dog off leash there. Being able to do this improves the quality of my life and my health and gives me great joy.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6239 **Comment Id:** 366161 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: dogs and dog owners are increasingly polluting the hiking/walking/running landscape. Stepping on dog poop is an every week and frequently everyday phenomenon. Exercising, yoga, circuit training, playing catch, kicking the soccer ball, playing frisbee are mightily constrained by the presence of dogs and dog poop. Dog owners and dog walkers do forget to clean up after their animal. Cryptosporidiosis proliferates...dog barking is irritating...dogs scare deer aw

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6276 **Comment Id:** 366395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Taking our dog to Crissy Field, Golden Gate park, etc. etc. is the highlight of his day and also a great way for us to meet and bond with fellow dog owners. Limiting the areas in which dogs can play really takes away from a lot of the charm and camaraderie of this amazing city.

Organization:

Commenter: Shannon N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6277 **Comment Id:** 366397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Even though most of the dogs are well behaved and are voice controlled it is common, almost daily, to observe dogs that are totally out of control; dogs chasing and fighting with other dogs, chasing after other walkers and bicyclist, nipping or biting people (this even happened to me as I walked to my office), and much more. And, it's not just the dogs but also the owners who don't pick up after their dogs, or if they do they leave the plastic bags lay on the ground for someone else to pick up. How is any of this considerate for others.

Organization:

Commenter: Fred Picavet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6284 **Comment Id:** 366415 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Everyone, even non-dog owners, enjoy having my very friendly dog be part of their park and beach experience. Before I was a dog owner, I always enjoyed the brief encounter with other people's dogs when I was outside.

Organization:

Commenter: Joe Sherer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6286 **Comment Id:** 366420 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sometimes dogs get excited and come up to greet me, but I have never had a problem with them. We all live in this city together, and it's the responsibility of each one of us to get along with others.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6289 **Comment Id:** 366441 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I enjoy hiking with my dogs in the Marin Headlands,Sweeny Ridge and Stinson Beach very much in my free time and i very much hope i will be able to do so in the future.There are already only a few trails available for dog owners so please don't restrict these any further

Organization:

Commenter: tanja baker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6290 **Comment Id:** 366443 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog gets so much enjoyment from being off-leash especially at the beach swimming in the waves. And from that my family gets so much enjoyment. Many times, strangers enjoy my dog also. Countless times we have had a stranger pick up the ball and throw it into the waves for my dog and the it is amazing the joy it gives them.

Organization:

Commenter: Maya Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6291 **Comment Id:** 366449 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need the option to swim for exercise. Swimming is a good exercise and not hard on joints. We often take our dog to the beach at Crissy Field. It's her favorite place to go and she wears herself out swimming and running. It's also relaxing and enjoyable for us to walk along the beach with our dog. We've met some very nice dogs and dog owners when the dogs play and chase each other running down the beach. Many people are not able to run with their dogs, especially older people, so there needs to be a place where the dogs can safely run or swim off leash. Dogs that have sufficient exercise are better behaved.

Organization:

Commenter: D Cibilich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6611 **Comment Id:** 367184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: DO NOT HAVE A DOG! But I enjoy the dogs and their very fine owners enjoying, as I do, the wild and full ambience of the beach. they are not harming any living thing, and their owners are meticulous about cleaning up their poop, as well as, cleaning up other detrius on the beach!

Organization:
Commenter: Sally Salaus **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6624 **Comment Id:** 367484 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are overrunning Fort Funston, and I used to love hiking there, but hiking there now is unpleasant experience. Other beach areas are impacted also, taking away some of the relaxation aspect of visiting the ocean.
Organization:
Commenter: Heather Evergreen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6627 **Comment Id:** 367495 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I support the National Park Service's plan to define dog access to public land. I am a dog owner, and my family enjoys walking with him on the beach. I also believe it is reasonable to define areas where dogs must be on leash, and where they are not permitted to wander freely'to protect wildlife and provide safe space for people. There are wonderful places along our shoreline where unleashed dogs make it difficult to enjoy the waterfront, especially for children.
Organization:
Commenter: Jim Pohl **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367535 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Many visitors (including families and seniors) to the GGNRA who do not own dogs actually go to places like Crissy Field so they can enjoy watching dogs having fun. For a variety of reasons, some people cannot afford dog care, are allergic to dogs, or are simply too busy and understand that they do not have the time to take care of a dog but enjoy the opportunity to watch the playful doggies.
Organization:
Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6640 **Comment Id:** 367566 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I live across the street from what is essentially a National Dog Park. When I take hikes through the park I'm frequently accosted by dogs mostly off leash. It's not at all like the experience I had in Volcanoes NP. While on a recent hike, I was immediately pounced on, by a dog. It's owner assured me that it was a "friendly dog" but it pushed me off the trail and into the bushes. I kept walking and passed numerous dogs running loose some without an owner in sight. As a hiker I don't know which dog is friendly and which isn't. I've asked owners to "please leash their dog", and the response in general has been quite hostile. During this hike I observed two

owners that had their dogs on leashes the rest of the dogs were running free. I find hiking in this park, not at all stress free and often is unpleasant.

Organization:

Commenter: John O'Hara **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368101 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is inadequate factual basis in the current plan for the proposed changes. The GGNRA claims it is responding to what it said were rising complaints from park visitors and park officers, yet it has failed to provide current data to back up that claim. We walk our dog in these areas and have rarely seen any altercations other than minor (and natural) dog-on-dog interactions.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368126 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Ft. Funston and all other Headlands: This cliff and beach area is more remote and more suited to less disturbing waterfront recreation, it still presents... trampling damage to native plants and chasing of bird life in fields and beaches, - places hikers and equestrian recreation in constant unwelcome and often volatile surprises on trails from dogs allowed to get ahead complacent owners, - expends too much public money to secure safety and rescue from falls off of cliffs - compromises sensitive cliffs from even more rapid erosion. Off Leash dog use must be confined to the most common sense remote areas of Ft. Funston and all other Headlands regardless of size. All trails whose sides cannot be fenced must be for Dogs On Leashes Only. Enforcement of beach and trail use must be strictly enforced. Map 16-C closes illustrates an acceptable compromise with the EXCEPTION that the inland off-leashes area and next to the parking lot MUST BE REMOVED and allow for dogs to be released ONLY when they get to the beach. More sensitive trails must be removed and ON-leashes until they arrive completely down the trails to the beach is acceptable. Map 16-D is preferred, but it would be hell frozen over to enforce.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6642 **Comment Id:** 368162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Visiting on weekends is now quite a challenge with hikers and joggers going about and not paying attention to the main path.

Organization:

Commenter: Ann O'Driscoll **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6648 **Comment Id:** 368220 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This includes enforcing laws banning dogs from certain areas of the park. In my 7 years as an HRT volunteer in the Marin Headlands, I have seen, first hand, how the increasing number of illegal dogs, even on a leash can harm natural habitat, jumping at quail, relieving themselves on native plants, and barking at visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim Morrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4316 **Comment Id:** 368255 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have seen Fort Funston go from one of the most beautiful areas in the City to a place that is totally overrun with dogs and where regular citizens cannot walk w/o being disturbed by a dog to say nothing of where one can step w/o encountering dog poop. Please don't let this happen to other areas of San Francisco

Organization:

Commenter: norma tannenbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6674 **Comment Id:** 368273 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my long experience of living on the Coast, I never experienced an incident of irresponsible dog-walking. I never heard or read about it in the local paper, The Half Moon Bay Review, which would be the first to print such story, and I never encountered anyone who was unruly or irresponsible.

Organization:

Commenter: Sherry Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6573 **Comment Id:** 368275 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The dogs are an important part of that - the fact that within the city limits a dog owner can let his dog run free along the sandy beach, romp in the water, play with other dogs, is a source of delight to me, to their owners - and to the doggies themselves.

Organization:

Commenter: Eleanor G Burke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368396 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Under Needs of Urban Residents, the SEIS refers to the needs of urban Park visitors as if dog owners were the only urban visitor group. Although there does not appear to be a specific estimate of the proportion of visitors to GGNRA that are dog walkers, one of the surveys cited in the SEIS (Tierney et al. 2009) indicates that among the survey participants, only

13% of those interviewed listed walking a dog/pet as the primary reason for visiting GGNRA. Other survey results suggest proportions of dog-driven visits at around 10%. out the needs of the other 90% of urban residents?

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368423 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It should be noted that Tierney et al. (2009- Table 71) found that a visitor who had made 101 or more visits to GGNRA in the 12 months prior to the survey had a seven-fold increase in likelihood of mentioning restrictions on dogs as a factor that would improve the experience of visiting the Park compared with visitors who had made one or none previous visits.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6550 **Comment Id:** 368577 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are other users of GGNRA besides dog owners and dogs, many of whom want to enjoy our National Park without the disturbance of somebodys barking dog running down birds. Many people visit GGNRA to picnic, hike, walk view wildlife, and simply enjoy nature and the beauty of the ocean.

Organization:

Commenter: NA NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4503 **Comment Id:** 368689 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: One of the highlights of my day is to walk on the path along the beach and watch the dogs playing. Most of the dog owners are very responsible and pick up after their dogs. I'm more dismayed at the horse poop that is left by the park police horses that never gets cleaned up. I'm amazed at how well-behaved the dogs are. i so enjoy their romping and chasing and running.

Organization:

Commenter: Helen M Kloepfer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6544 **Comment Id:** 368698 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In regards to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, I am primarily concerned about the lack of specificity and documentation of the negative impacts dogs have on the areas. I am often impressed with how well within the areas are organized by the GGNRA to limit the negative human and pet impact on the areas. I keep myself and my dog out of designated protected areas and observe that other visitors do the same out of respect,

enjoyment and desire to preserve the GGNRA and what it offers us every time we visit. If the negative environmental impact can be better measured and specified, I am confident that dog-owners can better participate in reducing or eliminating that impact while preserving off-leash privileges.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary-Lynn Garrett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6537 **Comment Id:** 368712 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have witnessed behavior of dogs and dog owners hundreds of times at Muir Beach, the Oakwood Valley Trail, the Miwok trail and others, and have seen responsible behavior the vast majority of the time.

Organization:

Commenter: Margaret Davies **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1236 **Comment Id:** 368764 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SEIS cites several surveys of visitor use and visitor satisfaction, including two done in 2011 in response to DEIS comments, that were so poorly done that their results are essentially meaningless. A 2008 visitor use survey at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field used people who intercepted people at these sites and asked about their park usage. However, the interceptors were observed by several people to actively avoid talking to people walking with dogs, hopelessly skewing their results. A 2011 visitor use survey at Fort Funston and Muir Beach, done specifically in response to DEIS comments, only counted people as walking dogs if they had a leash in their hand. People walking with a friend and the friends dog were not counted as a dog walker (because they did not have a dog of their own with them), even though they were only there to walk with the friends dog. A 2011 Visitor Satisfaction Survey was so confusing respondents didnt know if they were being asked about their satisfaction with current conditions at GGNRA sites or with the severe restrictions proposed in the DEIS.(

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4363 **Comment Id:** 368821 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I've just finished reading the section of the report on "Dogs and the Visitor Experience" and I found the presentation of evidence and the logical arguments presented to be very weak. In particular, the report cites results from a number of surveys of visitors related to their experiences with dogs in the GGNRA. The report avoids presenting a complete record of the comments or even the quantitative survey data - instead, the report selects a few specific comments and a few specific results that support the decision that the NPS prefers. This is not a scientific analysis in search of the best outcome - it is cherry-picking to find facts in support of a pre-selected conclusion. I was very sad to see the NPS representing its process in this way. For

example, the report states that "...In this report, 71 percent of public comments favored allowing off-leash dog walking in selected GGNRA sites (option B) and 28 percent of public comments favored the enforcement of existing leash laws in the GGNRA (option A) (NAU 2002a, 5). More than 500 respondents affirmed their belief that it is their right to walk dogs off leash at park sites. ..." Unfortunately, the first result, that 71% fvored off-leash walking is unhelpful, as it does not state the question that was asked, what the other options were, and what the probability of all the other answers being given. The second result, that 28% fvored enforcement of leash laws, is similarly flawed, as it also does not indicate what alternatives were offered, or what the other 72% o answers were. Finally, citing that there were 500 people who believe it to be their right to walk dogs off leash is unhelpful, as the percentage of respondents with this response is not given, nor are the other possible answers to this question and the distribution of answers provided. Throughout this analysis, the presentation of incomplete excerpts is not consistent with the use of such data to identify a best course of action, but rather with the use of data to support a pre-existing conclusion.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4363 **Comment Id:** 368822 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I've just finished reading the section of the report on "Dogs and the Visitor Experience" and I found the presentation of evidence and the logical arguments presented to be very weak. Another example, "...Almost one-third of visitors from each of four counties surveyed who had seen off-leash dogs while visiting GGNRA sites viewed that experience positively, but the largest proportion of visitors from each county stated that off-leash dogs had neither a positive nor negative effect on their experience at GGNRA (NAU 2002b, 20)...." Based just on this statement, that 1/3 favored off-leash walking, and that the largest group were ambivalent, it is clear that the fraction that opposed off-leash walking has to be much less than 1/3. The report selects a fraction of this particular result, describes it in an unbalanced way, omitting the part of the result that is inconsistent with the pre-existing conclusion. This is a textbook example of biased reporting. Another example of misleading reporting : "Of the dog walkers that responded to the survey ... 30 percent of individuals were not satisfied or slightly satisfied with off-leash dog walking opportunities their most frequently visited sites at the park (NPS 2012a, 11, 16)" By omission, does this mean that 70% o dog walkers were "highly satisfied" with the off-leash dog walking opportunities? As with the earlier examples, the GGNRA report selects a portion of the factual record, and describes it in a biased way.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369141 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Second, the number of park visitors has NOT increased dramatically over the past 20 years. In fact, in 1987 the GGNRA experienced its greatest number of visitors, coming in at 21,767,176 recreational visitors. According to NPS statistics, in 2010, the total number of recreational visitors was 14,271,503, down about 34% from 1988. The SEIS attempts to attribute

the decrease in visitors to a change in statistical methods, eliminating the visitors to the San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park from the GGNRA count. However, the SEIS ultimately concludes annual visitation to the GGNRA is shown to have reached a capacity of 13 to 15 million visitors as the following graph shows. (The graph was a part of our DEIS Comment). Consider also that in the past 20 years the GGNRA acreage has almost doubled in size, and expanded into San Mateo County. This puts a far larger population in direct proximity to the Recreation Area, yet the visitor numbers are down dramatically.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6561 **Comment Id:** 369505 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I frequently use and enjoy the GGNRA lands and am concerned about impacts from dog-related recreation on wildlife, habitats and other park users.

Organization:

Commenter: Marjorie Blackwell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6668 **Comment Id:** 369510 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do understand your concerns about bikers and walkers having access and feeling safe. If you actually go there it is obviously not an ideal place for bikers because of the heavy foot traffic. The walkers seem to enjoy meeting and greeting the dogs around them.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Kuntz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6604 **Comment Id:** 369524 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have a home at Stinson Beach that I go to regularly with my dog. There are many unleashed dogs that I see on this GGNRATbeach and there has never been a problem in the 20 years I have been bringing my dog there. Owners are very diligent about cleaning up after their dogs, I have NEVER found dog feces left behind on that beach!

Organization:

Commenter: Brenda L Deluca **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6665 **Comment Id:** 369534 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I've walked GGNRA trails for over twenty years with my dogs, without any negative incidents. The people I run into on these trails (Oakwood, Alta) almost all have dogs, and those that don't, are for the most part very friendly and supportive of allowing dogs on the trails

Organization:

Commenter: Scott Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6665 **Comment Id:** 369536 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: People are afraid of dogs and/or have been attacked by dogs, or just want to be in a dog-free environment ' As is already the case, almost all trails under GGNRA management are currently off-limits to dogs. There is a plethora of trails available for people who do not want any interaction with dogs to choose from; this is not the case for people who enjoy walking their dogs on the trails.
Organization:
Commenter: Scott Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6670 **Comment Id:** 369543 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The history of off leash dog use is that in areas where off leash dog use occurs it drives other park users from those areas because of biting incidents, the constant issue of dealing with dog feces that dog owners do not pick up, and the inability of other users to enjoy the park area without the presence of dogs.
Organization: Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
Commenter: Norman La Force **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369646 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: To understand visitor use in the GGNRA, the SEIS refers to two on-site visitor count studies, both of which are significantly flawed. The first, a two-phase study was conducted in 2008 at Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, and the Presidio is described on p. 310 of the SEIS: Whether this survey is valid or not depends primarily on how the interceptors chose the people to interview, If it was randomly chosen, there might be some validity in the results. However, at both Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, interceptors were observed actively avoiding talking to people walking with dogs and talking primarily with people walking without dogs. At Crissy Field, after watching an interceptor talk to many people without dogs and not talk to anyone with a dog, a dog walker asked the interceptor what he was doing. When he responded he was doing a survey of visitors, she asked if he wanted to interview her and he responded, No. GGNRA staff were alerted to problems with this survey at the time it was done, yet it is cited here. The inherent bias shown by the interceptors means any results of this survey - e.g., that 9.6% of the respondents listed dog walking as their primary reason for visiting the site - are essentially meaningless. I was at Fort Funston when the visitor count was done in 2011. I was there to walk with my friend and her dog (my own dog died several years ago and I am currently dogless). By the study protocol, I was likely tallied as either someone walking without a dog or as other. But I was there specifically to walk with my friends dog. Had I wanted to walk with my friend without her dog, we would have gone somewhere else. What about people walking the family dog? Would mom be listed as a dog walker, while her children were listed as not there to walk with their dog? Clearly, the survey miscategorized me and others like me walking with more than one

person to a dog. The survey clearly underestimated the number of people using the sites to walk dogs. Because of the problems with this survey, its results are essentially meaningless.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369647 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Finally, the SEIS describes a GGNRA Dog Walking Satisfaction Visitor Study done in 2011 on p. 304 as: The SEIS admits that only 897 people out of 7000 people contacted for the study actually completed the survey. Given such poor response rate, its not clear that the survey has anything meaningful to say. One stated purpose of the survey was to determine where people who now walk dogs in the GGNRA would go if dog walking was restricted as proposed in the DEIS Preferred Alternative, an attempt to quantify impacts on nearby city parks if DEIS restrictions were adopted. Then why were people who dont walk dogs or who oppose dogs in the GGNRA included in the survey? The SEIS reports one result of the survey on p. 305: Of the dog walkers who responded to the survey... 206 individuals were not satisfied or slightly satisfied with off-leash dog walking opportunities [at] their most frequently visited sites at the park. The SEIS says that 662 dog walkers responded, plus 20 professional dog walkers. This sentence seems to imply that roughly one-third of dog walkers are not satisfied with existing off-leash dog access. I took the survey, as did many people that I know. The wording of the survey was confusing. Some people who took it thought the questions about how satisfied you are with off-leash access referred to existing access, while others thought it referred to the off-leash access contained in the DEIS Preferred Alternative. Personally, I was in the latter group, because the survey was described as trying to determine where people would go if the restrictions proposed in the DEIS Preferred Alternative were in effect. I responded that I was not satisfied with the restrictions proposed for Fort Funston, my most frequently visited site, in the DEIS. Yet the SEIS describes my response as being not satisfied with the existing off-leash conditions at Fort Funston. Many people I spoke with in 2011 who had taken the survey were confused as to what it was asking. Because of this confusion, in addition to the small numbers of non-randomly-determined responders, this surveys results are essentially meaningless.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6590 **Comment Id:** 369668 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Recent Data and Experience Demonstrates that the Status Quo is Working Based upon the most recent enforcement data that has been released, CFDG understands that during the past year there have been reported 6 people bitten by dogs, 5 dogs that were fighting, 2 dogs that were rescued from cliffs, 2 scared person reports, 1 reported gosling death and a horse bitten by a dog. CFDG takes each of these incidents very seriously and is working with the SPCA and the GGNRA to support responsible dog ownership. The SPCA has been offering Off Leash Open Space dog-training classes that are very popular and successful at the Crissy Field Center and Grassy Airfield. But given the high number of visitors with dogs that are in the park each and every day, these statistics do not support the proposed alternative. CFDG recommends

that NPS take the most recent enforcement statistics into account and change the preferred alternative to A.

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Commenter: Martha Walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/18/2014)

VU4000 Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Enjoy Dogs (Substantive)

1. **Commenters would prefer to continue the allowances and restrictions on dog walking as they currently exist, stating that the status quo allows the greatest variety of use among visitors. Many commenters state that watching the dogs off leash is part of the experience of Golden Gate National Recreation Area.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 115 **Comment Id:** 345833 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: PLEASE DO NOT RESTRICT OFF LEASH AREAS!!!!!! i walk my dog everyday and have rarely seen any issues with off leash dogs. In fact, the only issues I have seen are with leashed dogs trying to go after each other! When dogs are under voice control, they all get along! Having people walk or run with their dogs off leash in the parks is a great thing for San Francisco. It keeps our parks safe because there are people there and less crime. One of the best things about San Francisco is being able to have dogs and owners enjoying the same parks and having dogs off leash does not infringe on anyones right to enjoy the parks!!!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Many commenters consider that the proposed limits on off leash dog walking to be too restrictive. Many commenters state that they would choose not to visit Golden Gate National Recreation Area if their dogs were not permitted. Many people visit the park on a regular basis, even daily, to walk their dogs off leash. With greater restrictions, visitors would have to travel farther to exercise their dogs off leash, and these areas would be overcrowded and more degraded due to the increased use; the visitor experience would be lowered for these reasons. Other visitors claimed that they would be forced to walk their dogs off leash in restricted areas, as there are not enough natural areas to exercise their dogs. Overall, commenters are concerned about the loss of opportunities to recreate with their dogs in a natural, unconfined setting.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 50 **Comment Id:** 338020 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I frequently walk my dog off-leash at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field. It is such a valuable asset to have places where my dog can run free, chase balls, swim in the ocean, and play with other dogs as she is unable to in her day-to-day environment. Dogs simply cannot get the same amount of exercise and movement when restricted to a leash and a weekend trip to these places tires her out more and makes her happier than anything else can. Yes, dog walking is inherently ripe for conflict, both with other dogs and people, but that is

exactly why it is absolutely necessary to have wide, unrestricted, off-leash park areas. Overcrowding and restriction of dogs via leash actually increases their territoriality and increases conflict. The GGNRA sites are one of the very few places where space is abundant and the rate of conflict is probably relatively low compared to standard, fenced-in dog parks. As use of the parks goes up, increasing restrictions will only increase conflict and the necessity for park staff to enforce rules and intervene in conflicts.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 204 **Comment Id:** 350106 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The idea that some of these alternatives provide "multiple visitor experiences" is simply not true. If I am a dog owner visitor, I cannot experience the beach, I have to walk on a paved path with bicyclists (and you know the bike coalition is just going to love that!) and pedestrians and have no view of the beach. Even though I live at the ocean, I have to walk my dog around the city streets, take her home, then go back out to the ocean if I want to enjoy it. That is simply ludicrous.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1380 **Comment Id:** 352420 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I love to hike and spend time in nature. I do so with a well trained, well behaved dog. She is an important part of my connection to nature. I would stop using the San Francisco Bay area parks if I couldn't bring her with me. Further more, I would probably move out of the area all together.

Organization:

Commenter: Ananya Hixon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 777 **Comment Id:** 353270 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It will be a disservice to a large population of tax payers who own dogs and use the GGNRA if off-leash areas are restricted or eliminated. To eliminate and/or severely restrict off-leash use of the GGNRA will force owners to have to secretly exercise their dogs in an area that has been off-leash for years. Dogs are a huge compliment to many families and exercising with your dog and family together is an immensely satisfying experience. The GGNRA is a beautiful asset to the Bay Area and should be able to be enjoyed by dog owners and their dogs in the same capacity that generations have experienced. Please keep the GGNRA open to off-leash in the same capacity that exists today.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura S Kennedy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2497 **Comment Id:** 358998 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am very against this proposed dog management plan. I am a dog owner and also have been a dog walker for the past 10 years.This plan will affect the people that actually use and enjoy the parks on a DAILY bases. Reducing the areas where dogs are allowed are only going to consolidate the dog/people use areas and those areas will become overused and damaged.

Organization:

Commenter: Tessa M DeFranco **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1140 **Comment Id:** 351694 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I appreciate the work that NPS has put into this document, but feel the proposed changes are too restrictive towards dogs and their owners. My main comment is that the Draft Plan undervalues the role that dogs and the opportunities to walk them play in the public enjoyment of the GGNRA. A very high percentage of the users of many trails and areas in the GGNRA are walking their dogs. Without that opportunity, these people (not to mention their dogs), would be stuck inside or on city streets.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrew Lowry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Several commenters expressed concern about park visitation if dogs are restricted from many areas. Because dog owners and dog walkers visit Golden Gate National Recreation Area regularly, there would likely be a void when the restrictions are put into place. Some commenters are concerned that undesirable people and behavior, such as accumulation of trash and visitation by vagrants, would increase.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6136 **Comment Id:** 365591 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The parks in our city are important to we who pay the bills (taxes), it is how we have our downtime, and if you tell me certain members of my family are no longer welcome, ie my dog, we will stop going and our parks will go unappreciated and could fall into the hands of droves of vagrant's encampments, trash,human feces, illegal activity, and even more used needles.

Organization:

Commenter: Ginny Lamini **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3546 **Comment Id:** 359176 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: You will see a HUGE drop in usage in those areas. It is not going to be something where suddenly people will show up because dogs are not around. It will be empty

land.

Organization:

Commenter: Triston McLaughlin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. Commenters expressed a desire to have designated on and off leash areas for dog owners, stating that dogs should have off leash areas but that certain areas are not appropriate for such recreation.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 111 **Comment Id:** 345828 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: People who support these rules are not dog haters. I often enjoy the company and energy of dogs but not all the time. Dedicating locations for off leash, on leash, and dog free zones gives us the opportunity to experience the park on our terms and not the terms of just one group of people. Again, I reiterate, you need to provide off leash areas for these folks.

Organization:

Commenter: Chris M Apicella **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 278 **Comment Id:** 350457 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I love dogs so much!!! But, I do feel that there needs to be some sort of 'accountability' for dog walkers who walk dogs off-leash. For instance, I work as the teacher on special assignment with the SFUSD Environmental Science Center at Fort Funston. Our site at Fort Funston is beloved, and has served SFUSD for ~40 years. The site works well to provide SFUSD's underserved population a no-cost overnight to experience the joys of nature. During my first year as TSA for this site, it has been interesting to see the massive dog walking population at the site. When I am not with the students, I often go up to chat, and pet the dogs, and truly appreciate that there is a majestic space where dogs can get their mental and physical stimulation in 'play dates' with other dogs. yet, I do believe that these spaces are shared space, and there needs to be a heightened sense of responsibility with some of the dog walkers. the students we work with often see countless plastic dog poop bags littering the trails, and dogs trampling through the native restored areas, which is one of the primary areas we work with our students. while I do value off leash areas, I do see that these ares are not taken care of and respected, and dog owners need to be accountable to clean up after themselves. I don't know what the solution is to this, but just wanted to provide commentary on this.

Organization: SFUSD

Commenter: Lisa D Wojcik **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Other Comments:

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 337968 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am completly against any of the options for Fort Funston except Alternative A. This is the only area we can run free and not impact any other users. The area is used by a wide cross section of beach goers, hang gliders, model airplane pilots, joggers, dog lovers, sight seeers, equestrians, and history buffs among others.

Organization:

Commenter: Bart Beeman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 16 **Comment Id:** 337973 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a 32 year resident of the Sunset District of SF and a dog owner who has used Fort Funston as a uniquely wonderful site to walk my dog for years, I must register my extreme disappointment at the proposals put forth by the NPS. Walking a dog off leash is one of the pinnacles of the dog ownership experience. It allows the dog to "be a dog". It allows the owner to get outdoors and walk in a pleasant environment with the companionship of their pet and to experience the pleasure of seeing their pet happy, free, socializing with other dogs, and getting real, unfettered exercise. Walking a dog on a leash is a mere shadow of the experience of walking a dog off leash and leashed walking should in no way be seen as an equivalent to off leash walking.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 65 **Comment Id:** 338950 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The discussion of the value of dog socialization is scant in the report. There are assertions that a ROLA rules would allow dog socialization. This is not correct. A key aspect of dog socialization is exposing puppies (dogs not yet under voice control) to a large group of well socialized and well behaved dogs (dogs that respond to voice control). By denying puppies exposure to large and varied groups of well behaved dogs (this happens at Ft. Funston, on Crissy Field, and periodically on Ocean Beach, for example on Saturday morning at 10:30 when there is an organized "small dog" walk), the population of dogs that qualify for ROLA will be reduced and the puppy owners will seek other places to socialize their dogs, and the ultimate result would be a radical reduction of the number of dogs in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: David Pollak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 86 **Comment Id:** 339919 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Ocean Beach is a CITY Park, not an environmental protection zone. City residents need places for recreation, so to, do their dogs. Many of us have taken on the

responsibility of owning, and often rescuing dogs knowing that we have access to open spaces at Ocean Beach and Ft. Funsten for these dogs to run and exercise both on and off leash. Simply removing this access with a stroke of a pen, through your over bearing plan is both unfair to those of us who have taken on the responsibility of these animals, but also unfair to the animals too. I fail to understand and comprehend any valid justification for your plan which is severely restrictive to dogs and to their owners. There simply is no good reason other than an overall strategy of the Park Service to implement programs which effectively eliminate the enjoyment of parks by the masses, and restrict parks to the use of the environmental elite.

Organization:

Commenter: Thomas O Lloyd-Butler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 116 **Comment Id:** 345834 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: PLEASE DO NOT RESTRICT OFF LEASH AREAS!!!!!! i run with my dog everyday and have rarely seen any issues with off leash dogs. In fact, the only issues I have seen are with leashed dogs trying to go after each other. The parks are for EVERYONE to enjoy and requiring dogs to be leashed means the i cannot enjoy the parks! That is NOT fair!!!!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 117 **Comment Id:** 345835 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am totally AGAINST restricting off leash areas in the Parks!!! The tradition in San Francisco having off leash dogs is a long and valued tradition! For years owners and dogs have been enjoying the parks together- please dont change that!! I do not even have a dog but I enjoy being in the parks with many owners and seeing the dogs have fun. If you restrict off leash, those dog owners will just walk on the street and the parks will be deserted!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 123 **Comment Id:** 346271 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am very saddened to hear that you are considering restricting dog access within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I am a responsible dog owner that enjoys spending my weekends enjoying the beautiful parks and beaches that are dog-friendly in Marin County. I moved here from Seattle, WA, with one of the big factors in my decision being how dog-friendly the San Francisco Area would be for me and my Golden Retriever. I respectfully request that you consider NOT restricting the current dog usage policies in the Bay Area/GGNRA. It will have a serious impact on my life of me and my dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth L Loy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 134 **Comment Id:** 346287 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Our family is so disappointed with your plan. We have trusted you with our land and you responded by taking away much of its primary use - for families with dogs. Putting dogs together in enclosed spaces often triggers fighting that one never sees in off leash areas such as fort funston. With so many challenges for families living in the bay area from cost to poor public schools why on earth would you take away one of the attractions of living here. Instead you are proposing that we don't enjoy nature hikes with our dogs a total loss for our family and a reason to consider leaving this city.

Organization:

Commenter: Carolyn Gereau **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 349907 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am against this plan. Please reject the proposed Draft Dog Management Plan This plan is bad! Do not further restrict off leash dog walking in the GGNRA. There are already so many places that dog owners are restricted to go; this further restriction of dog owners is unfair and will limit the ability of dog owners to enjoy the GGNRA which belongs to all of us. Further restrictions at Fort Funston just seem mean-spirited and intended to punish dog owners, I can see see that part of Chrissy Field east beach could be made as on-leash only, but every other aspect of this plan seems punitive toward dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Willingham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 180 **Comment Id:** 349994 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We use the off leash areas in GGNRA several times a month. Our dog is blind, and it is one of the few places she can run around without fear of cars or other hazards. If the off-leash areas are limited, we will not have such a great place to take her for exercise and safe play-time.

Organization:

Commenter: Simon Offord **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 182 **Comment Id:** 349998 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As the current draft of the Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact statement is unacceptable. It fails to adequately address the past practices of much of the land and places an undue burden on one group ,dogs and their owners, who have historically had many of these spaces open for their use.

Organization:

Commenter: Killian P Higgins **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 186 **Comment Id:** 350002 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: One of the reasons we love San Francisco is because of how dog friendly it is. Our dog is very active and with really limited backyard space, it's important to is to have parks and beaches where we can take her to get her exercise. Fort Funston is one of her absolute favorite places to go and run. Our family would not only be impacted by the measure to reduce off-leash areas for dogs, but it would also be very sad. Please reconsider keeping these valuable parks open to all families - human and animal.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer L Folse **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 204 **Comment Id:** 350103 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The document states: "Alternative F provides balanced visitor use (no dogs, on-leash dog walking, and dog walking under voice and sight control in ROLAs) as well as protection of natural resources and visitor safety." This is not true for Ocean Beach SPPA, zero dogs on the beach is not balanced, the alternative for the trail at Ocean Beach is sub-optimal This trail is heavily used by bikes and pedestrians. Banishing dogs to only this area is would be more disruptive to the bikes and pedestrians. In addition, dog walkers on this trail can't even see the ocean. How is that balanced? I can go close enough to the beach to hear it and smell it, but I can't even look at it. That's absurd

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 204 **Comment Id:** 350104 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In several places the document refers to the visitor experience. In the section of Ocean Beach I use, I would venture to say almost all of the visitors are locals that live nearby and half of them (if not more) are walking a dog. Forbidding dogs on this beach is certainly not enhancing the visitor experience; it is detrimental. I live just a few blocks from this beach. My dog and I love walking on the beach; it has given me great incentive to get out and get some exercise and has greatly enhanced my wellbeing. Some of these proposals would now shut me out from enjoying my local beach.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 206 **Comment Id:** 350112 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If the snowy plover is so delicate that it can't survive with dogs passing by on a leash, maybe we should let evolution take over and stop worrying about protecting it. Let it go. It enhances my life to walk my dog on the beach, the existence of the snowy plover does not

enhance my life at all.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 211 **Comment Id:** 350118 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As a dog owner in San Francisco, nothing makes us happier than taking our dogs to the various parks around the city. If half of those parks (the best ones, in our opinion) stopped allowing dogs, that would ruin the experience at all the parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Buckley White **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 227 **Comment Id:** 350149 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I respectfully ask, as a taxpayer, voter, and dog owner, for you to avoid any restriction of the limited off-leash spaces in San Francisco. Taking away our dogs' space to play would negatively impact what many consider to be a very dog-friendly city, and would certainly negatively impact the city's dogs and their owners
Organization:
Commenter: Danielle Hart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 257 **Comment Id:** 350370 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: After studying the maps and reading about the proposed changes to off and on-leash dog access to our parks in the news, we are dismayed that the Park Service is planning to remove so many places that have been open to the enjoyment of dogs and their owners for so many years. I think these changes are unnecessary. They will not benefit wild life or improve the park experience. Instead they will make the park inaccessible to many of its greatest supporters and most frequent visitors.
Organization:
Commenter: Axel Lambert **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 269 **Comment Id:** 350391 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I support Alt A on Map 19 A , Cattle Hill Sweeney Ridge area. The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups. Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.
Organization:
Commenter: jim d sullivan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 269 **Comment Id:** 350393 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I supportmar 21-A Alternative A for Rancho Corral de Tierra. The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups. Spreading out user groups is key to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers. Providing expansive dog walking within the Rancho will engage a valuable new segment of trails users in protecting these remote coastal lands.

Organization:

Commenter: jim d sullivan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 297 **Comment Id:** 350536 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a former resident and frequent visitor to Marin and San Francisco counties, I want to express how much having leash free areas in the GGNRA for dogs contributed POSITIVELY to the quality of life for people and their dogs. People benefit positively from dogs and dogs have a real psychological and physical need for open space and the ability to exercise without being on a leash; people also have this need! Dogs - and people - have an innate need to spend time in a natural setting, which the GGNRA provides.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Leeper **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 356 **Comment Id:** 351069 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: You are creating problems where none exist. 1. There is already a variety of visitor experiences in Bay Area - non-issue 2. No substantial problems instigated by off leash dogs - dogs who excercise are known to be less aggressive. non-issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Felicia Aron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 358 **Comment Id:** 351130 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Within a few days of going for a walk on the beach and enjoying, among other things, watching dogs scramble after tennis balls, I was surprised to learn that the GGNRA was planning to require that dogs be on leashes. Watching the dogs is as much a part of our enjoyment of the Dolphin Club I am familiar with and a user of the waterfront and beaches. I hope this bad decision will be reviewed and reversed, Its unnecessary, counter-productive, and extreme.

Organization:

Commenter: Cynthia Ehrlich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 362 **Comment Id:** 351162 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have concerns over the potential impact this can have on San Mateo County's coastal communities. By reducing the amount of trails people can access with their dogs and citing people for violations, GGNRA will be discouraging people from engaging in outdoor activities and enjoying their national park lands. GGNRA states that they have selected the Alternatives because it grants multiple user groups the opportunity to enjoy the property, allows for habitat restoration, and is justifiable and enforceable by NPS Rangers. For decades, dog walkers, non-dog walkers, mountain bikers and horseback riders have all enjoyed the trails that are now managed by GGNRA. Multiple user groups have been enjoying the trails together in the past and should be able to continue to do so.

Organization: San Mateo County Government Center, District 3

Commenter: Don Horsley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 369 **Comment Id:** 351275 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Historically, Muir Beach residents and dog owners from around Marin have always enjoyed off leash access at Muir Beach and the Headlands Trails. These proposed changes don't just affect residents of Muir Beach, where these areas are, quite literally, our backyard. The loss of these currently available areas for people and their dogs would change the quality of life for the worse for all Marin residents and their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Wynn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 370 **Comment Id:** 351277 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Oakwood Valley has been an area for me to walk my dogs for over 20 years. My dog walk off leash & are under voice control. To apply a leash law will impact my life tremendously in an awful way. I can not drive to Rodeo Beach every day to exercise my dogs. It is impracticle & unfair! There are seven to nine areas in Marin impacted by your plans & only one is off-leash. Alternative E is acceptable & doable for me & my "friends" - "Preferred Alternative F is NOT!

Organization:

Commenter: Claudia Alexander **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 378 **Comment Id:** 351286 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am writing to express my opposition to the GGNRA plan to severely restrict canine access to certain parts of the Golden Gate recreation area. I do not own a dog, but I certainly enjoy seeing dogs - along with their guardians - play at Ocean Beach, at Fort Funston and at Crissy Field.

Organization:

Commenter: Alan S Martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 394 **Comment Id:** 351309 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The proposed plan to ban people with dogs from 99% of GGNRA land would have a devastating effect on the people of San Francisco & the Bay Area. I ahve been walking my dog in all your parks for over 30 years. It means the world to be. This is an urban park given to the GGNRA with the explicit understanding that traditional forms of recreation would continue. We need recreation not an urban wilderness. The GGNRA needs to be held accountable to their promise to serve the recreational needs of the people of San Francisco.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 410 **Comment Id:** 351333 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The current status quo is incredibly unfair to those who DON'T own dogs. As a regular user of Crissy Field, it is frustrating to see almost the entire area overrun by off leash dogs. We all have a right to enjoy Crissy Field.
Organization:
Commenter: Chris Apicella **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 975 **Comment Id:** 351411 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I regularly take my dog and kids to all the areas you propose to restrict, and this will decrease our quality of life.
Organization:
Commenter: Marit Bakken **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1037 **Comment Id:** 351466 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a person who uses my dog as a tool in educating at risk youth about positive recreation opportunities in the Bay Area, I am very worried about the impact of your proposed dog management plan. On both access to recreation for all and the environmental impact by way of dog owners having to find alternate places to bring their dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Julie L **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1053 **Comment Id:** 351491 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Taking away use of the GGNRA open space for my main sport - walking my dog off leash - will significantly reduce my quality of life, especially as I get (even) older. Urban

dog ownership has skyrocketed to new levels over the past 2 decades. But, while we recognize a host of new sports - mountain biking, kite sailing, snow boarding - we have not recognized the new role that dogs have in our urban lives. There are national standards for the number of baseball diamonds, tennis courts and play areas but nothing about accommodating dogs in urban settings.

Organization:

Commenter: Julienne M Christensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1060 **Comment Id:** 351501 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I would like to add that having an open space, like Sutro Park, has allowed the neighborhood to gather. I would not have met all the people I have met in my neighborhood, had I not had a dog, and then met many of them with their dogs, at the park. We have built a strong, community, discussed safety issues, kept track of each other, and built a very nice community. As a single woman, transplanted from the East Coast, this community building has been invaluable.

Organization:

Commenter: Michelle N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1091 **Comment Id:** 351544 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a responsible dog owner I hope that the National Park Service will reconsider its stringent stance in limiting off-leash access to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I consider myself, like many others, respectful of the public land, native plants, and animals that are also trying to thrive there. All of us, regardless of pet ownership, have a stake in being able to enjoy the Golden Gate National Recreation Area - the time I could spend in the GGNRA would be very limited if I were not able to bring my dog or let him excercise off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1124 **Comment Id:** 351682 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have three dogs that, like I, live for being out on the trail in wide open spaces. I am an avid trail runner and will only run trails where I can take them with me. Half of the pleasure of running for me is to see the pure joy they exhibit when I take them out on the trail. The GGNRA was established to provide this outlet for creatures like us that live in such a densely populated urban area. To deny them access to these trails, is effectively denying me access to them as well.

Organization:

Commenter: Michelle J Bell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1132 **Comment Id:** 351689 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a dog owner for almost two decades and an avid supporter of protector our environment, I am strongly convinced that retaining the GGNRA pet policy as it has been for decades is wise public policy. GGNRA is a unique resource for Bay Area residents and losing this valuable resource as an off-leash access would seriously impact the quality of life for many of its residents.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Strogoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 466 **Comment Id:** 351747 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Walking my dog off leash, throwing her a ball, watching her swim and play wiht other dogs fills my soul and makes living in a city do able. Without off leash areas this city would lose a lot of appeal. Dog walking is one of my favorite recreational activities, it is simply not the same on a leash. We are becoming more isolatied having a place to stand with a group of people and share the joys of watching our dogs play & run is important socialization for people & dogs. Dogs keep some people from depression and going crazy, dogs need a place to run.

Organization:

Commenter: Kay Tsenin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 468 **Comment Id:** 351749 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My dog is my training partner. I seldom visit parks unless I can bring him along. Please consider that very many people have companion dogs and want to enjoy natural areas together. It is fine to have some fragile areas off limits to dogs but there should be ample opportunity for dogs on leash and even off leash

Organization:

Commenter: M Weihman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1156 **Comment Id:** 351782 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a dog owner in the city, we have limited areas to exercise our dogs. The elimination or severe restrictions of dog walking will impact large numbers of dog owners in the Bay Area.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1201 **Comment Id:** 351967 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: By reducing the amount of trails people can access with their dogs and citing

people for violations, GGNRA will be discouraging people from engaging in outdoor activities and enjoying their national park lands.

Organization: San Mateo County Supervisor District 5

Commenter: Adrienne J Tissier **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 551 **Comment Id:** 351986 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In my opinion, it doesn't address the following points: 1. Part of the GGNRA's founding charter was to preserve recreation for the residents of San Francisco, not to maintain a "backcountry experience" akin to a national park. 2. Off-leash dog walking is already prohibited on 99% o GGNRA land, providing ample space for people who prefer not to mix with off-leash dogs. 3. The vast majority of San Franciscans who enjoy these areas are walking their dogs. The proposals will prevent a large number of people taking recreation, but don't provide any clear benefit, other than to harmonize the rules with those of wilderness area national parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Darby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1252 **Comment Id:** 352171 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep the entire Baker Beach area off leash. I feel that the company of dogs greatly enhances my visit to the GGNRA, and I do not have a dog of my own..

Organization:

Commenter: Robert I Pochapin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1275 **Comment Id:** 352217 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My doctor has advised me that this type of steady pace walking is good exercise for my heart condition. Goldie's veterinarian also believes that daily walks in a place where she can socialize off leash with other dogs is also very good for her health. The Key Here is Recreation and they way you want to close off Fort Funston is not right and will ruin the quality of our Experience at Fort Funston

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1286 **Comment Id:** 352269 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog also gets much needed exercise by running into the surf and along the sand. It is a joy for me to watch this. It is a joy you will be taking from ME if off leash use is restricted. There are few areas that compare to the beauty and have the fresh air as the ocean areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard D Carrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1310 **Comment Id:** 352284 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have been walking my dog in the GGNRA for over 8 years and taking away space to walk dogs will have a negative impact on one of the biggest reasons for moving to Marin. As a dog guardian and citizen it would place me in a limited position in relation my enjoyment of the space and constrain my ability to properly care for my pet.
Organization:
Commenter: Maile McComb **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1424 **Comment Id:** 352529 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Further curtailing the amount of open space available for dog exercise will affect the dogs and dog owners in a negative way, and whether it will improve the lives of non-dog people is questionable at best. Please keep the rules as they are. We already are seriously constrained as to where we can exercise our animals.
Organization:
Commenter: Wendy A Umphrey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1426 **Comment Id:** 352532 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The idea that all the dogs that use Ocean Beach are to be restricted to an off leash area under the Cliff House that's approximately the size of a baseball diamond is so blatantly unworkable that it's simply ludicrous. The dogs and their owners would be packed like sardines in a ridiculously tiny space. It will absolutely ruin Ocean Beach as a destination for dog owners. Owners and their dogs should have access to - at bare minimum - the section of the beach from the Cliff house to Fulton Street, which is half a mile long, and will leave the remaining three miles of beach dog free. I hardly think that letting dogs have access to one-seventh of the total beach is asking too much.
Organization:
Commenter: Eileen Hoyt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1446 **Comment Id:** 352574 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am writing to countest the recent restrictions proposed for dog walking in the GGNRA. I have walked my dogs regularly at Crissy Field, off-leash, for 30 years. It is one of the great pleasures of living in San Francisco and is a local treasure. Our community has used this space for decades to no harm. The restrictions posed by the National Park Service are detrimental to local residents and their pets.
Organization:

Commenter: Linda J Belden **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 562 **Comment Id:** 352643 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Additionally, a dog management policy inconsistent with NPS regulations and increased public expectations for use of the park for dog recreation have resulted in controversy, litigation, and compromised visitor and employee safety, affecting visitor experience and resulting in resource degradation. The conflicts will likely escalate if not addressed in a comprehensive plan/EIS.
Organization:
Commenter: Carl H Delfs **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 574 **Comment Id:** 352658 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Fundamentally changing the off-leash allowances that residents have enjoyed for years will significantly impact the population of San Francisco in many ways, almost all of them negative. The current off-leash areas provide what I and many others, including the Supervisors, believe to be an equitable sharing of our open space between those with four legged companions and those without. I urge you to reconsider the changes being discussed.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher M Clarke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1079 **Comment Id:** 352702 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: For both dog owners and non-dog owners, the new plan would greatly diminish the quality of life in the Bay Area.
Organization:
Commenter: Wendy Woll **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1498 **Comment Id:** 352921 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a homeowner and full-time resident near one of the trail heads under consideration, I firmly encourage the National Park Service to adopt Alternative A - No Action. As a frequent user of the trail system, I have yet to see any negative impacts or conflicts resulting from dog walkers. Many of my friends and neighbors utilize the trails on a daily basis to walk their pets. This is a core part of our community, and encourages the usage and therefore vested interest for the continued stewardship and protection of our park system. Inhibiting park access for local families, lowers our quality of life, and reduces the public interest in the continued funding of the park system itself.
Organization:
Commenter: Daniel J Blumhardt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1506 **Comment Id:** 352938 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I don't even own a dog, but I love going to the beach and seeing dogs and kids running and playing. There is nothing more joyful. Please don't take an important aspect of life on San Francisco beaches away from us.
Organization:
Commenter: Leigh Allen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 716 **Comment Id:** 353029 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly favor multi-use of all trails to include hiking, dog walking, biking and equestrian. The undercurrent of "hikers only" attitude is from a small number of people who are the most active in pushing their agenda; while the majority of trail activities include dog walking, biking and horses too.
Organization:
Commenter: Steve Salisbury **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1537 **Comment Id:** 353032 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: These parks are important to the health San Francisco's dogs. Being that we dog owners take every opportunity to walk with our dogs, these restrictions would effectively ban us human residents as well from these parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Tim Dietz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1538 **Comment Id:** 353036 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And finally, the proposed new regulations will force me to use my car and drive long distances to walk my dog (who is solidly under voice-control) off leash, and will cut down on the time I spend with my family enjoying this outdoor space.
Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth A Hudson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1558 **Comment Id:** 353100 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a Bay Area dog owner, it's important for us to have a place to take our dogs for recreation. It makes for a happier dog and provides an inclusive community where all recreation needs are accounted for and provided. By SEVERELY limiting the areas for recreation for dogs and their owners, you are essentially saying that this is an area that dogs are

not welcomed. Please reconsider this proposal as it has such a massive impact on such a large population.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1581 **Comment Id:** 353149 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And finally, this is going to impact me and my work schedule and well being because I will be having to get into my car and drive long distances to walk my dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc., feeling like my dog doesn't have anywhere to run free, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeremy M Hughes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1594 **Comment Id:** 353168 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are very few beaches left near San Francisco that allow dogs to run free. Taking away the public's right to allow well behaved dogs to experience the beauty of California Beaches without being inhibited by leases is part of the joy of the experience. National Park Service should encourage complete families (including dogs) in their invitation to visit. Restricting dog acess to these beaches may mean a reduction on visits by the public.

Organization:

Commenter: Cheryl S Buckel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1603 **Comment Id:** 353174 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Ocean Beach is a wonderful resource for many types of people, and home to a number of species, including the snowy plover. I understand that there are many competing needs to be accommodated. However, NPS' preferred alternative seems completely unwarranted and unfair. Banning leashed dogs from Ocean Beach between Sloat and Stairway 21 will deprive hundreds of dog owners and their dogs of daily exercise and enjoyment. But based on my experience, the preferred NPS alternative will have a disproportionate impact on dogs and their owners, and a minimal impact on those people who only occasionally use the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: France M Jaffe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1607 **Comment Id:** 353188 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If these restrictive laws were to pass, not only would it affect Shasta's quality of life but it would also affect my family's quality of life. We LOVE the parks and beaches throughout the bay area. I will do everything I can to ensure that my family and dog have the

best life as possible. I would even consider moving to a more family oriented place.

Organization:

Commenter: Billy Campbell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1614 **Comment Id:** 353206 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Further limiting the areas in which dogs are allowed is absolutely absurd. A vast majority of living spaces in the Bay area do not provide enough space to allow a dog ample room for regular exercise, this is why most dog owners turn to parks and recreational areas to allow their dog the ample space. Further limiting these spaces will only result in a negative outcome for dog owners, their pets, and even those who do not own dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1620 **Comment Id:** 353213 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I walk at these locations with my dogs and use them as opportunities to meet up with friends from the Peninsula area and their dogs. If is a great socializing opportunity for the people and their canines. You shouldn't make a rash decision to negatively affect so many lives.

Organization:

Commenter: PAM LAMBROS **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1624 **Comment Id:** 353217 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please don't limit the space that I can walk my dog off leash in the GGNRA. I walk my dogs there every day. We would be very sad if we could no longer walk off leash in the GGNRA. We especially love going to ocean beach and fort funston. I am a responsible dog owner and walking off leash in the GGNRA benefits both my dogs and myself. Also, that is how we utilize these spaces for recreation.

Organization:

Commenter: margaret derring **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1630 **Comment Id:** 353225 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It also needs to be pointed out that the discussion is around park land that is clearly in an urban area - as such the needs of the city's citizens need to be looked after as well. Having places where I can take long walks with my dog allows me to get the exercise I need while also meeting my dogs needs. Without access to the small amount of land in the GGNRA currently available, I worry that many dogs and dog owners will not have sufficient opportunity to engage in recreation. It is thus critical to me that places like Fort Funston and Chrissy field remain open for off-leash dog walking access.

Organization:
Commenter: Evan Mizrachy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1642 **Comment Id:** 353240 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And finally, please consider that her daily walk at crissy field and the presidio with her dogs is one of my mother's few remaining pleasures in life - it both gives her exercise as well as provides her with a community of like minded peers of all ages. It would be very sad if this were no longer part of her life
Organization:
Commenter: Frances Hochschild **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1643 **Comment Id:** 353241 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are many, many places one can go if they really don't like dogs and only one great place in the area, Ft. Funston. If we take this area away, it will impact the lives of dog owners and dogs in the surrounding area. My dog loves to be at Funston, she does not wander off paths, she is kind to other dogs and I get to meet people in the city and socialize while enjoying the beauty around me. Please do not limit that for me, my family, my dog or my fellow residents
Organization:
Commenter: Female Dog Owner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2831 **Comment Id:** 353283 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: Please reconsider the proposed ban on off-leash areas such as Fort Funston. Proceeding with this ban will seriously impact the quality of life for ALL San Francisco residents, not just dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeanine Landsinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 809 **Comment Id:** 353341 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I have been walking my dog in the GGNRA for over 10 years and taking away space to walk dogs will have a negative impact on one of the biggest reasons for moving to Marin. As a dog guardian and citizen it would place me in a limited position in relation my enjoyment of the space and constrain my ability to properly care for my pet. It seems to me that there is already a limited space to walk dogs off leash and taking more away will only further crowd and burden the few areas left. I would argue that we need more off leash space as opposed to less. I can tell you from experience that a dog that gets a lot of exercise is a well behaved dog -> and that has a direct impact on the community and environment as a whole.
Organization:

Commenter: Patrick McComb **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 811 **Comment Id:** 353346 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: That's what makes the GGNRA a resource: because people have enjoyed bringing their families and family pets there to explore and play for decades. A day in the park with your dog, frolicking and foraging, or playing in the waves is an integral part of California recreation. We should be expanding access and reducing the limitations for off-leash park access.
Organization:
Commenter: Alizia Latimore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 844 **Comment Id:** 353405 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: This proposal if allowed to be put into effect will have profoundly negative consequences on the citizens of San Francisco. There is an abundance of land for all to enjoy the natural beauty and resources of the GGNRA. To focus on limiting areas for the 120,000 dogs that live here is going to have a drastic impact on the use and enjoyment not only of the GGNRA but our city parks as well. These limitations are severe, unnecessarily restrictive and will dramatically lesson the use and enjoyment of these areas for *all* citizens, not only those who enjoy the parks with their canine family members.
Organization:
Commenter: K G **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1667 **Comment Id:** 353507 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you regulate all off-leash areas to a few select 'mini trails' we could see over crowding of those trails and more intense debate from the 'non-dogloving folks'.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Brinkmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1673 **Comment Id:** 353522 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm not overstating the case nor being melodramatic when i say that if your plan goes forth as planned, if i can no longer walk my dog off leash in the areas you propose closing to dogs, I will undoubtedly leave San Francisco because what keeps me here right now, would be gone.
Organization:
Commenter: Cristina & Llop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1676 **Comment Id:** 353530 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: disallowing owners the ability to include beloved pets in the normal recreational activities of the family: hiking, going to the beach, sightseeing on our beautiful coastline, etc. will hurt not only the dog, but the family as well. We bring our dogs everywhere, to shop, on errands, and on vacations; to limit our recreational abilities with our pets would remove a core part of our lives that we spend with our pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Alexandra S Reinsdorf **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 877 **Comment Id:** 353535 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: By limiting the areas for dogs and their humans to roam, you sever the connection between man and nature and you deprive one of the more important contributors to the health of the planet - human cared-for dogs - a last space to act as dogs. it is cruel, unthinking, unconscious and unnecessary.

Organization:

Commenter: Virginia D Thomson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1686 **Comment Id:** 353589 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To restrict or prohibit its access in the name of a general policy suited for places more distant from a major city environment would deprive many good citizens of San Francisco of this uniquely positioned recreational opportunity.

Organization:

Commenter: Joe J Litehiser **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1687 **Comment Id:** 353623 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: we rely heavily on the exercise that he receives at local off-leash dog areas for his overall health. Limiting access to local off-leash dog areas would limit my dog's ability to thrive by depriving him of much needed exercise areas, not to mention the family time we (as a family) enjoy while interacting with our dog in these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Thomas R Henry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1698 **Comment Id:** 353655 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed management plan will take a toll on the whole family and limit our regular family weekend hike/beach days if we are not able to take our dog with us on these outings.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Ballinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1711 **Comment Id:** 353677 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And finally, with these restrictions I will be forced to use my car to access off leash areas and dog recreation, may look to other cities to meet my and my pet's needs and will in general not go on as many walks with my family as my 4 legged friends options will be restricted.
Organization:
Commenter: elizabeth m wiens **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1713 **Comment Id:** 353679 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Every weekend I travel to Muir Beach, Fort Funston, or Crissy Field to walk my dog. These are some of the only dog friendly places to visit in the Bay Area. If not allowed to visit these areas with my dog, I will not visit them at all.
Organization:
Commenter: John Hyde **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1722 **Comment Id:** 353697 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: These forays, while simple and modest, have become essential to our well-being. Should you decide that we can no longer take our little dogs with us on these restorative outings, that they and we can no longer enjoy their off-leash, voice-controlled romps, you will be depriving us of something that helps us manage our limited funds and family constraints.
Organization:
Commenter: Mark Bell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1731 **Comment Id:** 353710 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Let's not have an adverse impact on family life, preventing a child from throwing a ball for his dog and allowing the child the pleasure of watching his dog catch it in the waves and bring it back to him.
Organization:
Commenter: CHARLENE S Frischer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1749 **Comment Id:** 353732 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not pass this unfair ban on local beaches and parks - - as a dog owner and manager of a local pet shop, I know first hand that the happiness and lives of dogs and

owners alike will be severely impacted if you take away local parks and beaches from being popular dog-friendly locales.

Organization: K9 Scrub Club

Commenter: Christina S Valence **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1751 **Comment Id:** 353736 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am absolutely heart broken that we may lose our ability to walk on the trails that dogs will now be banned from. One of the biggest joys in the world is hiking with my pup. I am not the only one. There are already so little trails that we can go on, now only Rodeo?

Organization:

Commenter: melissa c herst **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1756 **Comment Id:** 353741 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRAs original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan FAILS to do.

Organization:

Commenter: Catherine Foreman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1781 **Comment Id:** 353764 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNR proposed changes to off-leash rules severely impact my husband and our dog. We are very much against this change, and ask that you consider the severe impact to the quality of life to individuals like us who have chosen to stay in San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Jodi L Morris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4753 **Comment Id:** 353846 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: If Fort Funston's off-leash recreation is prohibited or curtailed, the quality of my life will suffer dramatically. That's not an overstatement. Running my dogs at Fort Funston has been a large part of my enjoyment of San Francisco - - I go there to take exercise for myself and to visit with other dogs and dogs owners regularly.

Organization:

Commenter: Margaret E Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1808 **Comment Id:** 354134 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking my dog through the GGNRA lands is one my my greatest pleasures and a valuable resource for me. Please don't take that away from me.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1816 **Comment Id:** 354140 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Fort Funston is one of the last places where Humans and Dogs can enjoy nature as it was designed: to be open and free. While it may SEEM as though you are helping conserve the park by restricting dogs, in reality you are ruining that parks experience.
Organization:
Commenter: Allison M Berger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1819 **Comment Id:** 354144 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I respectfully request you review your proposal to limit dog use within the Golden Gate Recreational Area. Dogs are an essential part of our lives in America and limiting their movement in our parks and open space limits our human lifestyles as well.
Organization:
Commenter: Francine P Pinoni **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1830 **Comment Id:** 354278 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking my dog in these area is just so amazing! My dog is the reason I go out and we would miss going to these area so much. Where should we go if you ban these area? In the street where the dogs can walk on pieces of glass, eat chicken bones left over by people who don't know where the trashes are?
Organization:
Commenter: Thibault G Cartier **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1838 **Comment Id:** 354326 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm in favor of Alternative A to allow me and my pets to continue to walk off leash through the GGNRA, as well as having some public beach access areas to play. As an animal owner and nature lover it would be a huge loss to me and many people in the area to have out rights taken away altogether given the large space in question and leaving a smaller percentage to dog owners to occupy.
Organization:

Commenter: laura r miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 984 **Comment Id:** 354355 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose further restriction of dog access and elimination of off leash areas.Further restrictions of our open lands will reduce the quality of life we currently enjoy in San Mateo County. The areas that we are allowed to take our dogs to are already relatively few. Dog owners tend to be nature loving people who enjoy the outdoors. In many cases, they are the primary users of some of these areas. There are already many dog free options and there is no good reason to add further restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Riyad R Salma **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1857 **Comment Id:** 354382 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a disabled dog owner, places where I can exercise my dog are limited. My daily visits to Fort Funston are an important part of my life and that of my companions. This attempt to limit dog walking in the face of massive utilization by San Francisco residents and now massive protest is despicable. If it succeeds, the quality of my life will be lowered, as will that of the hundreds of dog walkers I see every day at Fort Funston.
Organization:
Commenter: Tameem J El-Bizri **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1878 **Comment Id:** 354421 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am strongly opposed to the the "dog management" Alternative F plan. Very little of the parks are available for dogs as it is. We frequently walk our dogs on the trails of Mill Valley and I have never encountered a dog which was destructive or out of control. Closing off trails to dogs essentially means that the people can't enjoy them either. I don't believe you have presented any solid evidence that dogs are threatening the parks or the trails.
Organization:
Commenter: Pam Kerwin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1884 **Comment Id:** 354439 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The family dog is the catalyst for these group walks, and, if restricted from these open spaces near urban centers, people are going to be even less likely to disengage from technology and enjoy the out-of-doors.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne Elefterakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1934 **Comment Id:** 354576 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Closing the parks to dog owners would negatively impact many of us at a tremendous level. I give annually for the privilege and would rarely use the parks if unable to do so w/ my gentle canine companion.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1955 **Comment Id:** 354612 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Losing the right to go play fetch at the beach would terrible for us both. Even the idea that we would be in a fenced off area is unsettling. It brings me a sense of peace to be able to walk a long stretch of beach with my dog at my side.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian Kenney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1959 **Comment Id:** 354619 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am not a dog owner, but it doesn't take a dog owner to see that the relationship between humans and dogs is important for human happiness and that it is akin to the human family ties in many if not most households in the Bay Area. Human/dog families need public places to be outside, be in the community, and be free to run and play (like human children need to be free to run and play). The detriment that these Alternatives would have on my friends' and neighbors' recreation opportunities and happiness, on the other hand, seems severe.

Organization:

Commenter: Sabrina Barry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1969 **Comment Id:** 354632 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not support the reduction in off leash area for dogs in San Francisco, and I also not support further restrictions on leashed areas either. The reduction is dog walking areas-both on and off leash would impact the way I enjoy the parks greatly. I do support any changes and do not see the need to do so.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Valente **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1977 **Comment Id:** 354641 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We would no longer visit these areas if he could not run off leash, and this would definitely lead to a reduced awareness and economic benefit for all of the surround

businesses and the concessions within the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea E Gaffney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2015 **Comment Id:** 354687 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to add my comments to the discussion regarding the proposed restrictions in allowing dogs off leash at popular locations such as Muir Beach. Many people move to Marin to enjoy the hiking trails and beaches we have available to us. Many of us own dogs. As the number of trails and beaches shrink that allow dogs it also limits where people who want to hike with their dogs can take them. The changes will deeply affect the quality of life for people who enjoy these areas WITH their dogs. I recommend that more areas are opened up for hiking with dogs rather than taking away the few current areas people can hike with their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Barbour **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2653 **Comment Id:** 354788 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I regularly take my ONE dog, who needs LOTS of daily OFF LEASH exercise to many GGNRA trails and beaches in Southern Marin. If I could not walk my dog off leash on these trails, I would no longer visit the parks.

Organization: private homeowner, single dog owner

Commenter: Betsy Alberty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2658 **Comment Id:** 354814 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Let us continue to take our dogs out on trails; hikes that take over an hour to complete. I want to be able to get away from the traffic, the concrete, people and be out in nature every day. I own dogs so I have to go out every day. I will not go out if I cant walk the dogs. If I am stuck in a fenced in area to play fetch I will not go there.

Organization:

Commenter: Carolyn Erdman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2880 **Comment Id:** 354895 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a child and dog parent, I do not have time (nor want) to walk my dog in a dingy tiny dog park, take my dog home, lock her up and go enjoy the lands that everyone else can enjoy on my own.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2887 **Comment Id:** 354930 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because pets need to excercise and people have small yards/apartments who have pets but no room. if you ban pets from parks some people will have no fun and not go to parks
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: thomas zhou **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2956 **Comment Id:** 355265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will restrict access to an important recreational opportunity for both dogs and their owners. Off-leash dog walking is an important opportunity for many to get exercise and socialize with others in the com munity, including with people of other races, ethnicities, socioeconomic statuses, physical abilities, etc.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Robert Durham **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2958 **Comment Id:** 355268 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I take advantage of GGNRA both with my dogs and without them, have not witnessed any problems with the presence of dogs. Further restriction of where dogs can be will produce a negative effect in such a great place to live!
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: kelly dame **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2973 **Comment Id:** 355289 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Reducing popular areas where dogs can be in the GGNA (of which already there are not many relative to the areas dog are not allowed -even on leash) actively discriminates against my use of the parks.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: kerry lan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2976 **Comment Id:** 355297 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is one of the few opportunities for our whole family to enjoy the

GGNRA parks, which we would not otherwise visit.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Gerardo Capiel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2979 **Comment Id:** 355305 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It would be a devastating loss to dog owners to not have these areas for off leash enjoyment. I know from experience that any time I leave the house to enjoy the outdoors, I have my dog. If my dog isn't allowed to enjoy these areas with me, I won't get to enjoy them either.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Jami Nadzam **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2983 **Comment Id:** 355310 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will limit the access my well behaved dog and I will have to the out-of-doors in San Francisco.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Margaret Pearce **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2986 **Comment Id:** 355321 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The PA would significantly and adversely impact the way we have been using GGNRA areas for both fun and health, for all three of us, for many years.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Steven Armstrong **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3007 **Comment Id:** 355347 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it poses unreasonable restrictions on dog owners. Healthy and safe access of public lands for dogs is extremely important to ensure the quality of life in and near San Francisco.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Michael Shaffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3119 **Comment Id:** 355379 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog

Management Plan because it hurts the quality of life for many of San Francisco's residents. Our dogs are part of our daily lives. Not being able to take them to the beach for our daily beach walks or parks to enjoy picnics with our families is a travesty and an infringement upon our rights.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: mercedes ruiz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3121 **Comment Id:** 355381 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will deprive my family, including my school-age son, of the ability to recreate with our family dog as we have for many years without harm to other people, animals, or the environment and deprive us of access to essential open space.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Karen Scarr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3128 **Comment Id:** 355388 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this plan is accepted and enforced I will no longer use the the GGNRA for personal enjoyment - Restricting these areas would cause me to find new areas of off leash dog play, all of which will not be able to handle the overflow resulting from these restrictions.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Helen Cleary **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2048 **Comment Id:** 355510 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: And finally, I reject these off-leash limitations because it will negatively impact my life and the life of my dog Vila. For 8 years I spent countless hours enjoying GGNRA areas with my previous dog LeeLoo. The joy in watching your dog happily romp on the beach and play with other canine pals, unfettered and off-leash, is like no other.

Organization:

Commenter: LaDonna Willems **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3684 **Comment Id:** 355603 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive and will keep me from using the GGNRA areas as I have over the past years. I enjoy going for long walks with my dog on Fort Funston and other GGNRA areas and the new plan will significantly limit my ability to do that.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Susheela Vasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3690 **Comment Id:** 355605 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...Whether you have a dog or not, its a joyful experience to be in the bay area with dogs off leash running free or at the parks the a leash. It allows people to feel a sense of com munity to the have your friends, family and dogs gather together. If you take this access away these areas especially Fort funston people will not be use/appreciated as much.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Renee Naleppa **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3879 **Comment Id:** 355617 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: One of the reasons I put up with the high cost of living is access to wonderful public parks which are dog friendly. Taking this away from tax payers seems unfair and eliminates a big part of San Francisco's attraction. Please think of a way that the park can be shared by all.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Jenny Hay **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3883 **Comment Id:** 355620 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it restricts the enjoyment of parts of San Francisco for my and my family (my chocolate lab included). We all really love our time in many of the areas this proposed plan will limit.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Aaron Bone **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2065 **Comment Id:** 355626 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am writing in strong opposition to imposing more leash restrictions. Any new restrictions on off-leash activity would have a significant negative effect on our experience - I often rave about how thoughtful the dog rules are in general and would be disappointed to see them changed.
Organization:
Commenter: John Paluska **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3889 **Comment Id:** 355634 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because thousands and thousands of Bay Area residents rely on this area for recreation use for ourselves and our beloved dogs. It is one of my favorite things in San Francisco and I don't know what I will do if it's taken away!

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Elizabeth Pickens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3891 **Comment Id:** 355637 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the exclusion of dogs in parks doesn't make any sense. There is so much com munity provided by dogs; allowing everyone to cross borders and relate in authentic way. Effectively sterilizing parks will have a negative effect on both dogs and humans.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: lisa maley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2072 **Comment Id:** 355644 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I very much enjoy being able to bring our dog with us, and have her off-leash in open areas, because it provides a way for our entire family to relax and enjoy outdoor time. Even when we do not bring our dog, I like seeing other people with their dogs - - it adds to the enjoyment of the setting, and gives us ways to interact with other visitors. I was disturbed by the GGNRA plans to limit recreational uses of our urban open spaces. There is little actual justification for these plans, and they would strongly undermine a popular, enjoyable, unique setting as it is currently used and valued by residents and visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3902 **Comment Id:** 355652 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will eliminate my enjoyment of the park by restricting my com panion's use.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Elizabeth Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3908 **Comment Id:** 355662 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because a key reason why we've chosen to live in this part of the country is having such access to local recreational areas and urban open spaces. Our family outings include

our dog more often than not. This draft plan threatens to restrict our options for outdoor family recreation to a significant degree.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Stephen Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4194 **Comment Id:** 355970 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the only times I enjoy the beautiful parks of GGNRA is when I am taking my dog to run, exercise and play. If he cannot be off-leash under my supervision in the GGNRA, then I will not be benefiting from the use of the parks either. I strongly support off-leash park use for responsible dogs and dog owners. Thank you.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: CONNIE SUN **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4207 **Comment Id:** 355980 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because our whole family enjoys taking our well-behaved dog to Fort Funston nearly every day of the week. He runs around safely off leash, we pick up after him, everyone gets some fresh air and exercise. This Dog Management Plan is a solution in search of a problem, and will greatly reduce the quality of life for many, many SF residents and their animals.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Ward Evans **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4208 **Comment Id:** 355982 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Living in an urban area such San Francisco is difficult enough to get access to wilderness areas, if new dog restrictions are placed, it will only force me further and further away from the places in which I love.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Michelle Trinh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4473 **Comment Id:** 356009 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA Plan imposes unreasonable restrictions which will have a very negative impact on the quality of life for people AND dogs!

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Theresa Gaydon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5353 **Comment Id:** 356019 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The local people and dogs will be the ones to suffer and pay the price for such an outrageous, negative plan.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Barbara Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5363 **Comment Id:** 356024 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I continue to drive across San Francisco in order to visit that beautiful area with my dog, on leash and with extra com postable bags to pick up after him! It would be heartbreaking for me to not be able to enjoy those walks with or without my dog.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Ellen Kenny Culp **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5366 **Comment Id:** 356027 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Without access for humans AND their dogs to the coastline, many residents, myself included will be robbed of the simple recreation I most treasure.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: lisa relth **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5368 **Comment Id:** 356030 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...my family and I take our dog for walks daily. The areas you propose to make off limits are one of the I only areas that my 3 year old twins and my dog can walk freely together. You would be limiting the ability for us all to play fetch and run together.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Allison Harrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2682 **Comment Id:** 357050 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please leave GGNRA open for off-leash play for dogs! That's the whole reason I visit your parks and I wouldn't come without my dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Katheryn R Grzeca **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357071 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: With the harsh restrictions in both Marin and San Francisco County, we will be forced to travel further and further to find outdoor recreational areas to enjoy with our dog. In short, the GGNRA preferred plan would severely impede our ability to enjoy the Marin and Bay Area lifestyle that originally brought us to the area.

Organization:

Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2701 **Comment Id:** 357109 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dogs have enjoyed spending time at many of these beaches for the last 10 years. Spending time with them at these beautiful places is a big part reason we moved to this area. There are already plenty beaches in the area that do not allow dogs. I certainly respect this, however the beaches that allow dogs are so few and between already that I would not know where to be able to enjoy this beautiful scenery with my four-legged companions should these beaches go away. As owners of well behaved dogs, where would you suggest we should be taking them instead? Let's please keep this area progressive and welcoming to man's best friend.

Organization:

Commenter: Elke O'Neill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2702 **Comment Id:** 357113 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have lived in this county for 34 years. One of my favorite things to do in life is walk with my dog or dogs either on the beaches (Muir, Stinson, Rodeo etc.) that we all get to enjoy or in the hills by my home and walk the trails everyday. I cannot imagine life without this. To take away this privilege away would be a SIN!

Organization:

Commenter: katherine d rose **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2743 **Comment Id:** 357160 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It's my understanding that you're considering closing Ft. Funston and other parks to off-leash dog walking. They are some of the few places left to walk dogs off-leash and really let them have a good time. I use these facilities often and it would really impact my family and my dog if they were made on-leash places.

Organization:

Commenter: Rob Sherwood **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2744 **Comment Id:** 357163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Eliminating or significantly restricting the access of dogs to Rancho will

significantly reduce my interest - - or at least my practical ability - - to use and appreciate the area. I'm sure the same is true for many others.

Organization:

Commenter: Peter A Peterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2800 **Comment Id:** 357504 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For dogs (and us, their loving human companions) to lose the right to play at the beaches and other areas of GGNRA would greatly diminish my and many others' experiences and enjoyment. Again, it's why so many of us go there.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Baigel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2807 **Comment Id:** 357526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is wonderful to see people getting outside with their dogs. They are getting much needed exercise, time outside which relieves the stress of the workday, socialization with other people, and quality time spent with their canine companions. It would be so sad if these recreational areas were restricted. There are so many people using these areas, because they have dogs. What would they do if they couldn't take their dogs to exercise and relax and have fun in these areas?

Organization:

Commenter: Mary Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2845 **Comment Id:** 357612 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For me, going to the beach without my dog really wouldn't be worth the effort because the pure joy would be missing.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan J Anthony **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2854 **Comment Id:** 357655 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a long-time San Franicsco resident, I spend every weekend at Fort Funston with my dog off leash and will be greatly impacted by new restrictions

Organization:

Commenter: Jack A Hannan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2860 **Comment Id:** 357679 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this plan is accepted and enforced I will no longer use the the GGNRA for personal enjoyment - Restricting these areas would cause me to find new areas of off leash dog play, all of which will not be able to handle the overflow resulting from these restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Helen N Cleary **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2869 **Comment Id:** 357690 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Timber and I make the trek to Fort Funston, Crissie Field and the Golden Gate Park every week and cannot imagine where we will go to enjoy such a profound experience if you go forward with your plan to severely restrict the off-leash areas on our National Parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Thomas Doerr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2304 **Comment Id:** 357700 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The constant proliferation of rules against dogs in parks is becoming a real problem. For many of us, walking our dogs is how we relax and cope with the daily stresses of life. When you restrict our ability to do this, it is going to have consequences for the well being of a great many people.

Organization:

Commenter: Wallace Marshall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2876 **Comment Id:** 357708 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please reconsider this new ruling because it will definitely keep me from enjoying the GGNRC.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Milo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3041 **Comment Id:** 357764 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We frequently also take out dogs to the Marin Headlands, Crissy Field, Presidio, and the southern parts of GGNRA (near Pacifica- -Rancho Corral de Tierra, Milagra Ridge, etc.) and would really be devastated if we couldn't do this anymore.

Organization:

Commenter: Damian Ekiert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3052 **Comment Id:** 357816 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a Mill Valley resident and property owner and I oppose the "dog management plan" (which is actually a "dog ban" plan). My use of the public trails in my neighborhood will be significantly impaired if I cannot walk my nine(9) pound poodle on these trails.

Organization:

Commenter: Janet L Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3063 **Comment Id:** 357859 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And if you stop to think for just a moment, you'll realize that you're simply going to push all the dog owners to walk their pets in more public areas, increasing those touch points between pets, pet owners and the very people who are complaining about dogs in the first place.

Organization:

Commenter: Melissa Mecca **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3100 **Comment Id:** 357907 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Ocean Beach is an urban beach that is heavily used by park neighbors and locals. The impact of losing the ability to walk a leashed dog on the beach or to sit on the beach with a leashed dog is a significant impact to the entire community.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3113 **Comment Id:** 357917 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: By banning dogs from 99% o GGNRA you are depriving dog owners from enjoying nature with their dogs. While I would love to see the Alta trail at the top of our street free of dog walkers - who bring up to 10 dogs at a time off leash - I think penalizing the rest of us is a little harsh.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean Lurssen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3136 **Comment Id:** 357924 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Limiting our parks and restricting the allowed hours to have the dogs loose and without leash will make very unhappy dogs and dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: niloofar ehsani **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3237 **Comment Id:** 358010 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. This seems to be a gut reaction in response to those who are not complying with the leash restrictions, but this will impact thousands of folks' ability to enjoy simple recreation with their dog!

Organization:

Commenter: Russell Latham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3244 **Comment Id:** 358017 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Dog Management Plan proposed will dramatically and adversely impact dog owners who already have limited recreation areas for our pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Briana Lafferty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3294 **Comment Id:** 358053 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I regularly recreate with my dog across all GGNRA lands and restricting access would greatly reduce the value provided by the parks

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3376 **Comment Id:** 358276 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed alternative. These areas have forever been a place where dogs can roam free. I know my dog is happiest when she can run freely through the sand and water at the beach. The new proposal is way too restrictive, and will prevent my dog and me from enjoying the daily walks that I have come to love and cherish.

Organization:

Commenter: Taylor D Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3385 **Comment Id:** 358300 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: i think dogs should be more free and not stay on leashes when they go out to the park. they should be able to run and get some exercise and do what they want. if dogs stay on leashes, they wont be able to get exercise and wont enjoy going to the park anymore. their owners wouldn't enjoy playing with their dog at the park because they have to stay on their leashes.

Organization:
Commenter: norton c **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3386 **Comment Id:** 358301 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a senior citizen with disabilities. My primary form of exercise and socializing is daily walks with my two dogs. I am very responsible about it. I clean up after my dogs, I keep them under voice control and do not allow them to destroy any natural habitat. Your plan to limit where I can walk my dogs will greatly inhibit my routine with my dogs causing me to have to drive many more miles to get to places I can legally walk my dogs off leash
Organization:
Commenter: Wendy J Wald **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2454 **Comment Id:** 358959 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: San Francisco is a wonderfully diverse community and a common thread that brings many of us together is our love and passion for our dogs and responsibly using the beautiful park to exercise ourselves and our dogs. This plan will drastically restrict our opportunity to come together as a community and create a very congested and challenging problem for dog owners to walk our dogs. Almost every dog owner views their dog as a part of their immediate family and stress the importance of keeping them safe and healthy.
Organization:
Commenter: Joseph Lijek **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3420 **Comment Id:** 359156 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Off leash dog areas in the city of San Francisco are very important to me and to many residents of SF who would not have a place to exercise their dogs and enjoy nature if these changes were to take effect. My quality of life would significantly suffer from this reduced off leash dog access to ocean beach, fort funston, and crissy field. Please listen to the residents of San Francisco and reconsider these devastating changes.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3435 **Comment Id:** 359224 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I don't currently have a dog in my household - because my landlord won't allow it. But I love dogs and the joy they bring. Personally, I see Fort Funston as one of the happiest places to go in the bay area because of the off-leash dogs frolicking in an open safe space. My cheeks hurt from smiling after a stroll in that area watching all of the pups having a wonder-full time. I'm an avid hiker and love meeting dogs and their companions on trail. The fact that there

are so few trails or open/park spaces where dogs are welcomed is a huge issue to me. I believe most dog guardians are extremely conscientious and respectful and that dogs should be allowed almost anywhere humans are. Please do not ban dogs from our treasured public lands and spaces.

Organization:

Commenter: Gabby Culver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3644 **Comment Id:** 359266 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am also concerned that the GGNRA's shifts in policies (and attitude) could curtail other recreational activities that city dwellers need in the future.

Organization:

Commenter: Maggie Biroscak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3732 **Comment Id:** 359424 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The NPS proposal is deeply flawed and it is a drastic change that will displace many thousands of users who reside in a dense urban area that offers few recreational opportunities for responsible guardians with their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth V Mooney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3756 **Comment Id:** 359470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: You are discriminating against a whole segment of the population here in my area by threatening to shut the dog-friendly portions of the GGNRA. Your new regulation would be very heavy handed when you consider only 1% o the GGNRA is accessible to dog owners in the first place. We rely on having some places to go where we can enjoy our beautiful open space with our dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3768 **Comment Id:** 359494 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Taking this away will devastate this city and honestly make me want to move away. I have been here for years and am a responsible dog owner who loves this city and DO NOT want our parks to become strict tourist motivated areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Simon N Dodgen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3832 **Comment Id:** 359947 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have two small very well behaved dogs that absolutely love going down to Crissy Field and to Fort Funston on a regular basis. The beach is a special place where they can play with one another and meet other well behaved dogs in a special environment free from cars and bikes. My wife and I do not have kids and it is a joy for us to share one of our favorite places with our dogs. It would be a shame if they were unable to go to the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Mark Siebert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3846 **Comment Id:** 359973 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The effect of taking so many trails away from dog owners would be to greatly reduce the number of not just dogs, but people who can enjoy these trails, as people with dogs will almost never walk without taking the opportunity to take their dog out. For many of us in Marin, having a dog in our lives is a great source of happiness, not just because we love our dogs but because they get us out walking and give us the opportunity to appreciate the amazing trails we have here in Marin

Organization:

Commenter: Betsy Appell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3863 **Comment Id:** 359993 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Cutting off this access in effect cuts off use by many citizens who no longer will be able to make any use of these areas since they use them primarily with their dogs. Both the people and the dogs need exercise and fresh air.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard D Carrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3966 **Comment Id:** 360229 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In all of those years, our dogs have never injured wildlife or frightened a horse on the trail. It is a fire road, with plenty of room for all. We share it with joggers, mountain bikers and hikers quite happily. Yet we will lose access to this trail if Alternative F is adopted. Our quality of life - every week - will be adversely affected.

Organization:

Commenter: anne c harper **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3973 **Comment Id:** 360316 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I enjoy the natural beauty of Ft. Funston but mostly appreciate the ability to walk my dog there off-leash. If the proposed leash restrictions are imposed, I would no longer

visit Ft. Funston.
Organization:
Commenter: Douglas V Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3975 **Comment Id:** 360326 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: At Fort Funston, most people who go there are dog owners and lovers. If you were to take away the rights of dog owners that are there today you'd really hurt a lot of families and dog owners. I'm sure that Fort Funston would become a desolate place with lots of shady people there and no sense of community or involvement.
Organization:
Commenter: Louis Riviere **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3994 **Comment Id:** 360386 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If any of the proposals "B" through "F" is enacted, dog owners will be left with but a few city parks with typically small, fenced-in dog runs - - certainly nothing like the vast stretches of beach we currently enjoy.
Organization:
Commenter: Bjorn Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4511 **Comment Id:** 360461 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I don't really care about commercial dog walking one way or the other, but any time I see large groups they're usually fine
Organization:
Commenter: Nate Rosenthal **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4513 **Comment Id:** 360463 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are an important and integral part of our social lives. Dogs need a place to run free. The great majority of dog obey voice commands and their people are mindful of the need to respect cleanliness and wildlife. Allowing areas for dogs and people to enjoy each other and nature with the restriction of a leash is valuable to our quality of life
Organization:
Commenter: Julie Allecta **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4526 **Comment Id:** 360479 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I feel like the plan is set up to fail because it will force more dogs in a smaller

concentrated area, which will actually negatively impact visitors than the current system.

Organization:

Commenter: Alexander Livingston **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4529 **Comment Id:** 360482 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Second, dog owners in the Bay Area are at the breaking point with restrictions. There are simply not enough areas to hike with dogs. I am a very law abiding citizen. But I will not allow my dog to suffer because of unjust rules. Many, many dog owners feel the same. So we will walk our dogs illegally.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4544 **Comment Id:** 360502 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I support the status quo. It seems to me that the 1979 pet policy is working very well, and the new draft policy and EIR are not premised on evidence that a change is needed or warranted. To the contrary. If the draft proposed policy were enacted there would be significant adverse impacts. These have not been adequately studied. You would not only reduce the recreational enjoyment for large numbers of people who use the GGRA, you would unduly stress certain areas that remain approved for dogs, as well as SF city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeffrey J Cole **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4545 **Comment Id:** 360518 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The joy that I get from being able to get outside and walk and play with my dog off leash is indescribable. My dog is the reason for me to get exercise, to meet other people and to love the fact that I live in San Francisco. Please do not take that away from me, my dog, and all the other dog owners in our beautiful city.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine Segalas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4563 **Comment Id:** 360619 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed plan will, essentially, create an environment of tense discord and will not be promoting the thing that we as San Franciscans value most: diversity, responsibility for our environment and living harmoniously. There must be a better way that does not isolate or alienate a huge percentage of the population and take away rights of people who have built their lives with the expectation of having equal and free use of such an important and beautiful place.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4594 **Comment Id:** 361099 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When I visit we like to go to several beaches. It would be an enormous disappointment to not be able to visit some of these beautiful places while other visitors without dogs are welcome.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4595 **Comment Id:** 361110 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The provides an opportunity for exercise, enjoyment of trails, socializing with friends as we walk (with friends who own dogs or don't) and keeps me sane, gives me the ability to hike and enjoy our lands which brought me here, and without I would leave. I need this recreation with my dog. San Francisco is full of people like me, who need to recreate with their dogs. Dogs need to recreate as do we. The proposed limitations will make my life, my dog's life, and my friends' lives, who walk with me, impoverished.
Organization:
Commenter: Natalie D DeWitt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4671 **Comment Id:** 361307 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Removing these wonderful off leash beach places will make more dog owners break the law so that their dogs can have some healthy excercise. Please leave these off leash beaches as they are. There are so many dogs in the area that need a place to go.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4680 **Comment Id:** 361317 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The report even states in general that there were only minor to moderate consequences to natural resources for the majority of these changes with moderate to major changes to those of us who walk our dogs in this area. It is specifically mentioned in the report that citizens of the Bay Are have few other options of allowing their dogs to exercise off leash, and removing this highly-utilized resource would result in severe detriment to dogs and humans alike.
Organization:
Commenter: Lawrence Lin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4680 **Comment Id:** 361319 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I walk my dog regularly in various areas of the GGNRA and the adoption of this severely restrictive plan would significantly reduce my use of these all NPS facilities
Organization:
Commenter: Lawrence Lin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4715 **Comment Id:** 361377 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The shear joy my dog expresses while running off leash at his favorite park, Fort Funston, is unparalleled and certainly a difficult experience to recreate anywhere else, especially given the staggering lack of available ROLAs in the Bay Area. After waiting patiently all day for me to return from work, it is the only opportunity for him to socialize, get exercise and simply be a dog. It is also a great opportunity for me to enjoy the beautiful landscapes and soundscapes the GGNRA has to offer. The loss of this daily enrichment would be devastating and have a severe impact on quality of life not only for myself and my dog, but certainly for the hundreds of visitors who flock to the parks each day.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4735 **Comment Id:** 361412 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I walk my dog regularly in various areas of the GGNRA and the adoption of this severely restrictive plan would significantly reduce my use of these all NPS facilities.
Organization:
Commenter: Samantha Stevick **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4735 **Comment Id:** 361413 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The report even states in general that there were only minor to moderate consequences to natural resources for the majority of these changes with moderate to major changes to those of us who walk our dogs in this area. In my years of frequenting these areas, I have never observed any violation of NPS policies by dogs off leash. It is specifically mentioned in the report that citizens of the Bay Area have few other options of allowing their dogs to exercise off leash, and removing this highly-utilized resource would result in severe detriment to dogs and humans alike.
Organization:
Commenter: Samantha Stevick **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4754 **Comment Id:** 361423 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I understand are under consideration for banning of off-leash and on-leash

dogs. If the goal is to simply prevent people from enjoying these areas with their dogs (and by virtue of that, prevent people from going to those areas), then I think such a policy will achieve that goal. If that is NOT the goal, then I ask that the policy be considered more carefully.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynn L Krieger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4781 **Comment Id:** 361517 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of the original intent for the use of Crissy field. The restriction will also impact all park visitors in a negative way, since there will be increased concentration of dogs in a much smaller area.

Organization:

Commenter: Katherine Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4787 **Comment Id:** 361527 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who recreates on a regular basis with my dogs in the GGNRA, I am strongly opposed to the preferred alternative outlined in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The overly restrictive nature of the proposed restrictions will prevent large number of law-abiding dog owners from recreating in the area and offering dogs a natural and healthy outdoor experience.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4792 **Comment Id:** 361543 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: During my daily walks in the area between the horse stables (Amber Ridge, Moss beach Corral) and Renegade Ranch I have NEVER seen anyone out there who did not have an off leash dog, a horse or both. Who will use this beautiful open space if dogs are restricted to leashes? Dogs can not be adequately exercised if they are restricted to leashes.

Organization: MDG

Commenter: Margaret P Kritzer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4792 **Comment Id:** 361546 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For three decades my husband and I have been walking our dogs off leash in the Rancho Corral del Tierra open space. Contrary to GGNRA's stated purpose to maintain recreational activity, the closing of more than 4,000 acres to off leash activity would seriously limited the use of this land.

Organization: MDG

Commenter: Margaret P Kritzer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4799 **Comment Id:** 361560 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And while I'm not comparing a pet, no matter how beloved, to a human being, I am saying the love is real and that our collective lives will be dramatically impacted by a huge reduction in available space to not only bond with our pets, but for them to simply get outside.
Organization:
Commenter: Ben Dutro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4824 **Comment Id:** 361601 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a woman I greatly enjoy the peace of mind of being able to hike solo on trails with a dog by my side. This is one of my most treasured activities. Without my dog along I do not feel comfortable alone on hikes, and I know there have been cases of women being harassed and attacked on trials. Limiting dog friendly trials even further also limits my own access and enjoyment of the outdoors.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4825 **Comment Id:** 361605 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Having your dog tethered to you is much different from being able to run and play with your dog off leash. And having to walk your dog on city streets instead of being able to enjoy the beauty of nature lessens the experience.
Organization:
Commenter: Marla Miyashiro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4827 **Comment Id:** 361608 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It may be selfish of an old man such as myself, but I can't bare the thought of having this special time each day, with my favorite companion, denied to me because of fears that something "bad" might happen which has never occured, from my experience, for the last 28 years!
Organization: none
Commenter: David L Bichl **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4864 **Comment Id:** 361643 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Requiring us to leash our dogs would not serve to protect Fort Funston, it would only serve to ruin the experience for both dog and human.

Organization:
Commenter: Hugh Chodosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4865 **Comment Id:** 361645 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Losing these areas to off leash policies would be an incredible loss to everyone who seeks out these places to spend time with family and their pets
Organization:
Commenter: Lloyd Breeland **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4883 **Comment Id:** 361696 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting off-leash areas would significantly degrade this environment by eliminating an activity enjoyed by thousands of visitors every year.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard Springwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4898 **Comment Id:** 361734 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In summary, walking off-leash with my dogs, in a mindful way, respectful of non dog owners and the environment is hugely important to my enjoyment and well-being. I find that the SEIS and the GGNRA attitude toward responsible dog owners such as myself, will preclude our enjoyment, exercise and some of our most treasured experiences.
Organization:
Commenter: sanford goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4927 **Comment Id:** 361785 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This kind of drastic limiting measure will not just impact the quality of life of our dogs but also our families who enjoy the companionship and small amount of freedom allowed in these parks.I often meet people who don't own pets but come out to watch the dogs swim and run around as well as tourists who enjoy taking photos of my dog's "swim team".
Organization:
Commenter: YVONNE MELLING **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4970 **Comment Id:** 361871 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please take a considered, broader approach to the changes you want to make. I live in the Bay Area BECAUSE I enjoy the outdoors, and the recreational treasures we all share. Drastic cuts in the access to OUR TAX-PAID LAND to our family (which includes our dog)

would be a huge loss to our quality of life here.
Organization:
Commenter: Thomas Roth **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5011 **Comment Id:** 362000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We would be devastated to lose access to the proposed areas...and an important part of our way of life in Marin County.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa D **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5017 **Comment Id:** 362008 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If the GGNRA's preferred alternative for Rancho Corral de Tierra (Alternative B, No dog walking allowed except on-leash on a few trails near Montara and El Granada) is enacted, it will be to serve the Park Service, not the taxpayers. It will also be a sad day for all of the residents and visitors who have used this land for dog walking over the last five decades.
Organization:
Commenter: Marilyn F Wacks **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5047 **Comment Id:** 362112 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The threatening and restrictive scope of the GGNRA plan would prevent us inhabitants from the privileges the area has traditionally benefited us, reversing fundamentally the recreational character of our territory.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5106 **Comment Id:** 362188 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: the impact of this law will not only impact the overall happiness and well-being of many bay area citizens, but it will also put undue stress on local parks and other areas that dog-owners will have no choice but to rely on for recreation.
Organization:
Commenter: Tara A Medve **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5109 **Comment Id:** 362191 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I implore you to keep a significant number of areas in the GGNRA off-leash. This is not about dogs, but about the citizens of this area that own these dogs. These areas exist

for our enjoyment, and I find it truly enjoyable to allow my dog to go for a walk with me while he is off of a leash. The current proposed plan is simply to restrictive to dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Casey G Jackson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5112 **Comment Id:** 362198 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am also concerned that if I or my children should move to San Francisco or Marin or bring dogs with when we visit, we would not be able to enjoy these areas with our pets. As a hiker, biker and outdoor enthusiast, I have not had negative experiences with dogs in the GGNRA and would like to see the off leash access preserved for ourselves as well as future residents and visitors at these recreation areas.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5132 **Comment Id:** 362262 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The park would cease to be a useful recreational area to me and my dog. I have plenty of places where I can already walk her on-leash, and more convenient, albeit less enjoyable and more cramped, off-leash areas. My quality of life would be noticeably diminished if restrictions were put into place, and as someone who plans to live and vote in San Francisco for the next few decades, I will be paying close attention to GGNRA's response to the concerns of responsible dog owners like myself.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Fleitas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5156 **Comment Id:** 362294 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am against the banning of off leash dog parks. Those of us living in highly efficient multi family buildings need areas for our dogs to play offleash. Banning this amenity would do a disservice to us and our pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Ryan M Figley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4233 **Comment Id:** 362303 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: New information has recently come to my attention regarding the draft proposal for the reduction of off leash dog areas at Crissy Field. Recent data (2013) released by the GGNRA shows that , despite thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been only a handful of dog related incidents of any kind. The reported incidents involving people are substantially higher. This data clearly negates the theory by Mr Dean, who claims that dogs are

creating so much havoc at Crissy Field that the expenditure of $2,000,000 is required to hire more rangers to police the area. This simply is not true and is proven by this recent data. No more " could be a problem" but just the facts borne out by this data. Additionally,when Crissy Field was created, one of its stated purposes was to create more area for off leash recreation , in anticipation of the increased growth in popularity of dog ownership. Proposing the reduction of such areas at Crissy Field is an unjustifiable reverse of course.It will lead to the opposite situation where cramming an evergrowing number of off leash recreation into a sharply decreased area will have a negative effect on both dog owners and the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen L Dooley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4238 **Comment Id:** 362307 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: To close the Fort Funston or limit the access for "off lease dogs" would definitely be a mistake. Think of the impact it will have on neighborhood parks. Also the impact on thousands of responsible and loving dog owners who will be denied the opportunity to socialize their dogs, exercise their dogs and contribute to the city by having "well behaved dogs"

Organization:

Commenter: Judith Larosa **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5172 **Comment Id:** 362441 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The current proposal ignores the many advantages we derive from the park as it exists today; should it go into effect, I would be extremely unlikely to patronize the park in the future - as it would have no advantages over my neighborhood dog park at that point.

Organization:

Commenter: Anthony Dorie **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5180 **Comment Id:** 362465 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Marin county is a wonderful and special place to live. We all appreciate and value our access to nature - the mountains and hills, trails, ocean and beaches. Enjoying it all w/our loyal and trusted friends, our dogs, is a quality of life bonus. PLEASE - do not take that away.

Organization:

Commenter: Dalia Beyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5183 **Comment Id:** 362517 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I frequently enjoy walking at GGNRA with my dog and letting her run freely at Fort Funston or Ocean Beach - and I would not have reason come and enjoy the GGNRA

without her as often. I do not think that limiting off-leash dogs will increase visitors to these areas - a large part of the GGNRA is already on-leash (or without dogs), so I do not see how limiting the historically off-leash areas materially affects the choices for those without dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Julia N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5185 **Comment Id:** 362528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog is well-trained and not a problem for other hikers or animals. To prohibit our long-standing use of these areas, or to limit that use to on-leash walking only, would be tragic.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen Gimber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5198 **Comment Id:** 362578 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What is a beach, hikes, without dogs? Won't go to any beaches or hikes without dogs. It is lonely without your friendly furry buddy!

Organization:

Commenter: Ryan P Witwicki Faddegon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5202 **Comment Id:** 362595 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The changes in policy would adversely impact many individuals who have chosen to reside near these public recreational areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Johannes Rothlind **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5206 **Comment Id:** 362601 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To be honest, if we couldn't bring Tundra with us, we wouldn't take advantage of the beautiful parks of the GGNRA because the appeal for is is that we can enjoy the land as a family.

Organization:

Commenter: Noelle G Gibbs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5209 **Comment Id:** 362607 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a dog owner, I believe that removing access to dog-friendly beaches and trails as part of this plan will have a decidedly negative impact on the well-being of pets and their

owners in our community. We believe that there is already a dearth of open spaces where dogs can have healthy, stimulating exercise. We would like to continue to have access to these great areas for years to come.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Son **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5210 **Comment Id:** 362608 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog and I will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Lazarow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5216 **Comment Id:** 362622 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that one of my family's favorite activities will be swiped off our "Fun to-do List". We are an active family with an active lifestyle and much of our lifestyle includes our dog. Our household is happy hugely in part to our dog and limiting access to our dog's favorite playgrounds (I.E. Fort Funston, Muir Beach and Ocean Beach) will be devastating to us all.

Organization:

Commenter: Rebecca Sheng **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5224 **Comment Id:** 362687 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Without off-leash recreation, I probably wouldn't have visited these parks more than 3-4 times a year. The opportunity to walk and enjoy nature with my dog is keeping this senior citizen fit and socially connected hundreds of other people who come to the park for off-leash recreation.

Organization:

Commenter: K Hu **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5228 **Comment Id:** 362733 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The current draft plan is far too restrictive and would negatively impact many residents who currently enjoy access to the GGNRA. Recreation is a vital component of a vibrant urban area and we should preserve and expand recreation opportunities, not limit them, if we hope to create a more livable City. I recommend that the plan maintain the access that is permitted today for humans and dogs alike. A

Organization:

Commenter: Lily Gray **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5238 **Comment Id:** 362749 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that one of my family's favorite activities will be swiped off our "Fun to-do List". We are an active family with an active lifestyle and much of our lifestyle includes our dog. Our household is happy hugely in part to our dog and limiting access to our dog's favorite playgrounds (Fort Funston and Ocean Beach) will be devastating to us all.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362889 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The proposed preferred alternative will results in millions of people being unable to recreate with their dog(s) - in the GGNRA lands these same families support with taxpayer dollars.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5292 **Comment Id:** 362897 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I regularly visit Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and many other public recreation areas with my dog- it is a huge benefit to both of us to have access to these beautiful natural resources. If I was unable to take my dog with me on these trips to decompress from city life I would likely stop visiting some of my favorite recreational areas because seeing my dog happy and running free is also a huge stress reliever for me! Please reconsider this drastic and hurtful proposal.
Organization:
Commenter: gaelan h mckeown hickel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5299 **Comment Id:** 362916 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash walking is extremely beneficial for both pet owner and pet alike. It provides a sense of freedom that is not attainable on city streets or many of the other existing parks in San Francisco. For me personally, it provides my primary source of exercise on a daily basis to hike at Fort Funston with my dogs. There are hundreds of people and their pets that will be displaced from an activity that is and should be available to them. Please consider the impact that it will have on the current and future dog owners as well as the neigbhorhoods and city parks that will see a large increase in dog activity.
Organization:

Commenter: Adam Damico **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5356 **Comment Id:** 362998 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It's great for people and dogs alike to be able to get out and enjoy the beautiful California coast and weather, and for the dogs to frolic and socialize and run out their energy. Dog owners already have so few places they can take their dogs, and I sincerely hope the NPS deeply considers all of this when they make their final decision about what to do with Fort Funston and Crissy Field, but removing these as options for dog owners in they bay would be a huge loss for everyone.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5364 **Comment Id:** 363017 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: For many dog owners, especially the growing numbers of childless people and empty-nesters, their dog is a member of their family. Denying such families the ability to use the parks for the simple pleasures of off leash play - such as throwing and chasing a stick -is not only unnecessary and wrong, but is ultimately not in the interest of the parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Rochelle Nason **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5389 **Comment Id:** 363039 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Areas to walk dogs off leash are already so limited. Reducing them further will truly be a detriment to our area- -it certainly will be to me and my - -both the human and dog memebers.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan M Fry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5424 **Comment Id:** 363200 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I believe it is important to note that when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs in this urban recreational area. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Lynn Keller **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5427 **Comment Id:** 363214 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The purpose of these recreational areas within the city is to give people and their dogs access to trails and beaches. Denying access for our dogs would prevent many people for enjoying these recreational areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Anna Fabiano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5428 **Comment Id:** 363216 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Playing with my dog in an open area that I would choose to walk in alone as well (as opposed to the terrible dog parks) is one of my greatest joys. She is well behaved, under voice command and I pick up after her. Limiting us access to federal parks is unkind and unfair
Organization:
Commenter: Sheila McMullen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5437 **Comment Id:** 363251 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Reducing the amount of off leash dog areas will restrict where I can take my dog out to run, play with other dogs and get some exercise. In all of the off leash dog areas I have been to in San Francisco, the one thing I have always appreciated is how clean and open they are. From my experience, dog owners who come to these areas pick up after their dogs, are responsible with their dogs and enjoy the opportunity to let their dogs be free to run and play. I've had nothing but positive experiences. The new policy seems to be too restrictive and will make it more difficult for me to take my dog out when I'm in th area.
Organization:
Commenter: Teresa E Ernst **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5453 **Comment Id:** 363307 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Eliminating these off leash options would seriously impact hundreds of thousands of families in San Francisco. There are environmental solutions that don't involve ignoring the needs of so many of our citizens.
Organization:
Commenter: Julia T Barber **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5455 **Comment Id:** 363310 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Why would the GGNRA want to cut off the enjoyment of the majority of the people who hike, with their dogs. Having the freedom to let your dog run , using it's God given energy , and love of outdoors, is something we cherish and should cherish for all our generations

to come
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Lyons **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5463 **Comment Id:** 363318 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting that access will be detrimental to many and Lessing opportunities to keep eyes on some of our most valuable assists. The actions of the few can not block the needs of the many. Let's police those that don't follow the law and allow respectful citizens the freedom to enjoy the outdoors with their canines.
Organization:
Commenter: Brian reccow **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5486 **Comment Id:** 363350 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Taking away city residents' ability to connect with nature in this way, alongside their dogs, will erode the very feature that connects us most to the city and to each other as a community. Please don't take this away.
Organization:
Commenter: monica tang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5494 **Comment Id:** 363366 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We live here and expect to be considered when changes that would drastically limit our lifestyle are on the table.
Organization:
Commenter: neva j bonehill **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5499 **Comment Id:** 363878 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Forcing dog owners back into the urban parks, most of which are already over crowded will have a disastrous impact on the quality of time spent for owners and dogs.
Organization: self employed dog trainer
Commenter: Aleen Vorhies **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5509 **Comment Id:** 363885 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash please in the Bay Area is a God sent! My dogs and I love exploring the coast while they run and jump across the shore. We are always mindful to pick up any waste and respect that these places are very special/unique. It would be horrible to see these places go

away, I feel that would negatively effect the sense of community with loving/active dog owners that enjoy hiking with their pets.

Organization: Dynamically Fit

Commenter: Precious S Moreno **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5530 **Comment Id:** 363907 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many of the families who are left do have dogs and this misguided policy impacts us negatively as well as the many other dog owners who are upset.

Organization:

Commenter: Megan G Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5551 **Comment Id:** 363936 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To remove the very few trails and spaces that our dogs can com along on would be detrimental to all of us, not just our pets. It is often the dogs that help us out of the house everyday for a much needed walk/hike.

Organization:

Commenter: Maria C Ask-Hed **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5558 **Comment Id:** 363942 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having places like Fort Funston to walk Wilbur off leash is honestly one of the contributing factors as to why I chose to remain living in SF and buy a home and start a family. It is a huge part of our lives. I walk there, I pick up trash along the way, while Wilbur gets the necessary exercise and socialization he needs to remain a physically and emotionally happy dog. Please save off leash dog space. My happiness depends on it.

Organization:

Commenter: Rebecca M Dworkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5560 **Comment Id:** 363943 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I think these restrictions would dampen the experience of many many people (not to mention their animals). It will also encourage folks to break the rules, though I know this generates revenue.

Organization:

Commenter: john p whitty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5601 **Comment Id:** 363986 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please please please leave these few trails that are open to dogs off leash, as they are currently. My family cherishes the times when we take our dog to the beach, hike on oakwood trail and simy enjoy the outdoors with our energetic yellow lab. Dog parks are not the same and provide no satisfaction or exercise for our family.

Organization:

Commenter: Loren Quaglieri **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5607 **Comment Id:** 364006 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I ask that you please dont banned off leash. I take my dog here monthly and its the only time we have freedom to enjoy. Its a getaway I'm sure not only for me but for many others to enjoy with our pets. Fort funston is a very special place for me and my dog. I would hate to not be able to feel free and comfortable like we used to if she can't be off leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Monica Duenas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5617 **Comment Id:** 364011 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing because I would extremely disappointed if the GGNRA decided to implement their Preferred Alternative because it is unjustly restrictive. Losing valuable off leash areas and privileges would significantly alter the experience in the GGNRA which I enjoyed before I was a dog owner.

Organization:

Commenter: Seth N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5638 **Comment Id:** 364058 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is important to us as a family to be able to visit outdoor areas and beaches that allow our dogs because it provides our whole family with exercise, vacation, and a community feeling. Especially during the summer months when it is hot out, we cannot leave our pets at home on the weekends, thus restricting beaches and off leash areas will severely limit our ability to travel to Muir Beach and Stinson Beach on the weekends.

Organization:

Commenter: Jamie Coughlan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5641 **Comment Id:** 364061 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan is overly restrictive and serves no legitimate purpose, since there is no problem with the current use of the GGNRA by dogs and people. Over 50% o San Francisco households have dogs, and to implement the plan would adversely impact the use and enjoyment of these areas. Please listen to the overwhelming local response to the issue, which has been in

favor of keeping the off leash use as-is.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher W Stuart **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5644 **Comment Id:** 364064 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog I think that turning the off leash area into a restrictive area will prevent me from recreating with my dog. It will also be detrimental for my dogs health as I rely on that open space for my dog to run and exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Nia Reate **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5659 **Comment Id:** 364085 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The draft dog management plan would, for thousands of families, wipe out the opportunity to enjoy the recreational opportunities of the GGNRA. The parks would lose visitors, and future generations would not be able to enjoy the beautiful areas the GGNRA controls.

Organization:

Commenter: elizabeth cavagnaro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5673 **Comment Id:** 364107 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm a strong supporter of the off-leash environment because, as many dog owners might agree, the freedom of movement is an integral part of the participating in the outdoors. Requiring a leash limits my ability to enjoy my freedom outdoors and makes my experience seem limited at best.

Organization:

Commenter: Nick v Christianson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4373 **Comment Id:** 364128 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Relative to the comments about visitors, I strong disagree, while there there may be a few exceptions, the visitors I have experienced love to see the dogs, I have seen their joy and taken more pictures of them with my dog then I can begin to count . The welcoming dogs make a statement on behave of our City, they say we are friendly, and love animals. The visitors like that and it is good for the city too !

Organization:

Commenter: Judie L Doherty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5688 **Comment Id:** 364151 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please adopt the least restrictive means for off-leash dog areas in Northern California. There are so few places where dogs can be free and play. These places allow citizens and owners to become a community. Eliminating off-leash dog areas will impact our ability to make use of California's beautiful trials with our entire family. Please do not make a change that is not necessary and will substantially limit thousands of families' ability to enjoy nature with their companions.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5698 **Comment Id:** 364163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Organization:

Commenter: Carly M Braak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5720 **Comment Id:** 364184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not allowing dogs on most of Pacifica's trails will keep us from these spots or cause us to become lawbreakers when in reality we are stewards of the trails we frequent, always monitoring litter, watching for grafitti, and caring for the native plants. Please, please, please keep our parks friendly for 2 and 4 legged beings who need each other and need fresh air and exercise.

Organization: Pacifica Beach Coalition

Commenter: Lynn M Adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5763 **Comment Id:** 364261 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The impact to dog owners and their dogs will be to eliminate existing spaces and concentrating them into even smaller areas. Dogs need space to run free and the areas selected in the past met the criteria but also protected critical wildlife areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Kevin Ivanovic **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5765 **Comment Id:** 364269 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The draft dog management plan for the Rancho Corral de Tierra is based on

conjecture and guesswork. The fact is that dogs have had free access to the Rancho for years and the plan is concerned with future possible impacts. The plan cites no current impacts of the years of dog usage, and thus lacks scientific merit to restrict dogs in the future. The overly restrictive dog use recommendations would be hardship to both dogs and their owners and it in direct contradistinction of the purpose of the RECREATIONAL area.

Organization:

Commenter: Lawrence M De Young **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5790 **Comment Id:** 364304 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a bird lover AND a dog lover. Please please please save some places for my dog to run. There are already so few. I am hard pressed to say what thousands of dogs (and their owners) in SF will do without a place like Ft. Funston, where they can run and play.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura Burrus **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5806 **Comment Id:** 364338 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Proper exercise is very important for a dog's health, and my companionship with my dog is an important part of my own pursuit of happiness as a resident of San Francisco. I believe the new plan reduces my right to enjoy living in my city, for reasons that have not been scientifically substantiated or are simply administrative over-reach.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Zimmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5815 **Comment Id:** 364359 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I find it challenging to understand why the GGNRA is proposing a plan that essentially limits my enjoyment of this national treasure so drastically that I would rarely use it. Currently I play in the GGNRA 1-2 times a week, almost always with my dogs. This plan would take away one of my primary outdoor recreation areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate Clayton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5829 **Comment Id:** 364373 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My use and enjoyment of these areas would be entirely curtailed if I could not take my dog with me. Since dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, I would no longer have any reason to visit or use the Recreation Area. There isn't a compelling reason to eliminate my access to the remaining 1%.

Organization:

Commenter: Ned Black **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5846 **Comment Id:** 364393 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please, please, please keep the off leash areas as they are today. There are so many dogs in the bay area who love to run free. I love to take my dog to Fort Funston several times a month. Where are we supposed to go if we loose all these areas?
Organization:
Commenter: Anne Marie Nyquist **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5867 **Comment Id:** 364436 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Even those who won't have to get rid of their dogs will lose a very valuable resource, one for which there is simply no other alternative anywhere in San Francisco. Nor, for those who live in the city and work long hours, or don't have a car, is there any credible replacement for it outside the city.
Organization: dogsofsf.com
Commenter: Adam A Lang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5879 **Comment Id:** 364453 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: A man or woman with their best friend (their canine) should not be restricted from their pursuit of happiness: the ability to enjoy life with one another. Whether it be playing fetch or going on walks, it is ultimately necessary and just simply cruel to restrict pets and their owners from doing so.
Organization:
Commenter: Genevieve Yip **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5895 **Comment Id:** 364491 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am very concerned about proposed reductions in off-leash accessible areas in the GGNRA. These proposals ignore the interests of the community. There are more dogs than children in San Francisco. For many pet owners, their animals are an integral part of their family. Excluding dogs from access thus excludes their owners as well.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrew Middleditch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5898 **Comment Id:** 364499 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If the only places left for us are over-crowded dog parks, so much of the joy of

dog ownership will be taken from both dog and owner, because both dogs and humans need exercise and the joy of variety of experience for health and happiness.

Organization:

Commenter: Elisabeth Weir **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5915 **Comment Id:** 364629 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I request that you do not go forward with these new dog leash laws. I am a gay male with no children. My dogs are my children and my immediate family. My family and I have spent countless hours at Fort Funston and Chrissy Field enjoying the outdoors and exercise that off leash activities allow. This update to your leash laws will without a doubt reduce my quality of life.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen D Leach **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5957 **Comment Id:** 364786 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I wish to formally and firmly oppose the new GGNRA draft dog management plan. I am a frequent user of local park areas with my dog, who is always well behaved, and who I always clean up after. These outdoor recreational areas are what makes life in the city possible for my family and my dog, and it would be severely restrict our ability to happily and healthily live in this city we call home.

Organization:

Commenter: William Geddes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5966 **Comment Id:** 364828 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need exercise every day and urban residents with busy schedules may not have more than one opportunity to exercise outside. If that time is with a dog - - under your plan - - it will be less likely to be in the GGNRA

Organization:

Commenter: Gary Beberman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5975 **Comment Id:** 364845 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Without a place for my dog to run around safely, our quality of lives (and our neighbors) will plummet to an unacceptable level. Inadequate levels of exercise lead to behavioral problems, which will ultimately disturb the peace for many San Francisco residents (barking, property destruction, etc.).

Organization:

Commenter: Laura A Kelso **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6006 **Comment Id:** 364887 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks frequently with both family dogs , I feel that turning the off leash area into a restrictive area will prevent me from recreating with our dogs. It will also be detrimental for my dogs' health as I rely on that open space for them to run and exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6041 **Comment Id:** 365029 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not restrict off leash areas! This is one of the few areas left where people and dogs can enjoy the beach together. I know I will visit less often if I am forced to leave my pets at home
Organization:
Commenter: Cristin A McKee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6047 **Comment Id:** 365245 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Canine access to these lands is a huge part of what makes the San Francisco Bay Area such a wonderful place to visit, to live, and to play, and, quite frankly, implementing the drastic changes proposed in the GGNRA's new Draft Dog Management Plan would completely change my life and the lives of my beloved pups.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6059 **Comment Id:** 365281 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: For some people, the only walking they get to do is when they take their pet outside. If you reduce the places available for people to take their pets for fresh air and exercise then you are depriving people of an essential experience that enhances their lives and makes modern city living bearable.
Organization:
Commenter: Natalie Forman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6066 **Comment Id:** 365295 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: IN FACT, I TRAVEL TO YOUR RECREATION REGULARILY SPECIFICALLY TO LET MY DOG RUN OFF LEASH. I WILL NOT VISIT IF I CANNOT DO THIS.

Organization:
Commenter: Lisa E Hettler-Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365361 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA's preferred alternate will prevent me from recreating for my own health in the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 20 years - for which I have caused, I might add, no more adverse affect on these properties or the local environment than have my fellow hikers, joggers, bicyclists, hang gliders or windsurfers who use the same beaches and trails.
Organization:
Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6086 **Comment Id:** 365392 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. As someone who regularly walks, runs, and picnic's with my partner and her dog in these areas, the plan would severely impact our use and enjoyment of these areas. It is already hard enough finding a place where we can go to run with the dog, and this new plan will make it even more difficult.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6087 **Comment Id:** 365395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: So, if I understand this correctly, the Park Service is interested in imposing new rules and regulations that will severely limit the use of the GGNRA by the local population, and will need a 5x increase in staff in order to implement and enforce these new restrictive policies. A consequence of this proposal will be 5X more park service staff wandering about in the GGNRA writing tickets and otherwise interfering with the use of the park by a smaller and smaller number of citizens.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6093 **Comment Id:** 365405 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: More importantly, I am vehemently against a proposal that would limit off-leash dog areas. Particularly given the lack of supporting evidence to justify such a change, and the dramatic affect it would have on dog owners who ultilize the space to permit their dogs to get exercise, it appears prudent to permit the off-leash areas to remain as is.
Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6100 **Comment Id:** 365411 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If GGNRA applies this new management plan, I will no longer visit these properties or donate to them.
Organization:
Commenter: Krista N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6121 **Comment Id:** 365480 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If I have to switch back and forth between on-leash and off, or stay restricted to a small, unattractive area near the parking lot, I am much less likely to go there at all.
Organization:
Commenter: Kate Hellenga **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6150 **Comment Id:** 365628 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am writing to express my opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is too restrictive and prevents me from enjoying the beach with my dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Philip D Battat **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6157 **Comment Id:** 365662 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Further, the NPS must face the fact that the present policy does provide immense opportunities for public use, in a manner that generally has only very minor negative impacts, and that all of the preferred alternatives will only marginally reduce the negative impacts while substantially reducing the opportunity for enjoyment.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6172 **Comment Id:** 365741 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is with great sadness I see you are preparing to ban my access with my dog to large areas of Ocean Beach, Ft. Funston, Baker Beach, Rodeo Beach and many other areas. My dog and I go for long walks in these and other areas that will be curtailed under most the plans that have been published, especially the 'preferred alternatives'. In fact the long walks we take will be impossible in all of these areas.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6177 **Comment Id:** 365756 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This would be very short sighted to close down Funston as a leash free area for dogs. In the grand scheme of things, Funston is a small part of that coast line. Please don't deprive the dogs and their human owners of the outdoors. Walking a dog on a leash around the neighborhood just does not cut it compared to the Funston experience.
Organization:
Commenter: Jim Thanos **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6208 **Comment Id:** 366119 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Bringing our dogs to the park is the main way we enjoy the parks. I'm certain I wouldn't frequent them as often if dogs were not allowed.
Organization:
Commenter: Erik J Lovlein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6211 **Comment Id:** 366124 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We are dog owners and are very saddened to learn of the planned severe restrictions for on-leash dog walking in the GGNRA in Pacifica. We would be very happy if you will allow leashed dogs on the Bootlegger Steps at Mori Point. We always liked to go down a different trail - the road going east should be fine for dogs since it's very wide. If these are not kept open for dogs we won't be walking there as we won't go without our dog and we need uphill walking.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Herring **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6214 **Comment Id:** 366131 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I suppose that the National Parks may achieve a very slight reduction in certain kinds of events by eliminating the use of this location for recreation, but there will be an immense reduction in my enjoyment of these lands.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6235 **Comment Id:** 366154 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It's such a wonderful place to visit, but under these new rules, I and many others like me, would no longer find it as great of a place to visit.

Organization:

Commenter: Scott Rooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6268 **Comment Id:** 366368 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Since the number of dogs using the open areas is fixed (or only slightly variable), if you remove the majority of the open areas impact will be focused and magnified in those areas. This will lead to more complaints from people who are afraid of dogs and the eventual removal of all off leash walking in GGNRA. Dog walking will then be concentrated on the few remaining bay area parks that allow off leash walking, and the cycle will repeat itself. Diffusion of impact is a better solution.

Organization:

Commenter: Miles Pickering **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6294 **Comment Id:** 366459 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Limiting the off-leash dog areas as severely as your plan proposes will restrict residents' enjoyment of their city and their lives. As a resident of a neighborhood with no current off-leash dog areas, I can attest to the the emotional and physical benefits of being able to roam free with my dog at Fort Funston and wish you were creating more such areas instead of reducing them.

Organization: Valencia McCoppin Neighborhood Watch

Commenter: Susan Parker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6612 **Comment Id:** 367190 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe older owners who currently enjoy taking their dogs to these areas will have a more difficult time if the areas are restricted. The sense of community is important to those people as well.

Organization:

Commenter: Alice Sakamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6613 **Comment Id:** 367193 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Removing these wonderful off leash beach places will make more dog owners break the law so that their dogs can have some healthy excercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Roberta Rovner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6634 **Comment Id:** 367553 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please think of the joy that will leave all the lives when you restrict the off leash laws. My biggest pleasure at 78 years old is spending freetime with my dog, tally, & bringing along a two legged friend to share the fun. I walk every day!
Organization:
Commenter: Patcie Garelick **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6635 **Comment Id:** 367554 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA lands are my favorites: the Oakwood Valley Trail in Mann, Mon Point in San Mateo County, Cnissy Field, Lands End and most of all Fort Funston in San Francisco. I would be devastated if access to these places were to be restricted.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrea Patterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368109 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: With the harsh restrictions in both Marin and San Francisco County, we will be forced to travel further and further to find outdoor recreational areas to enjoy with our dog. In short, the GGNRA preferred plan would severely impede our ability to enjoy the Marin and Bay Area lifestyle that originally brought us to the area.
Organization:
Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6644 **Comment Id:** 368170 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting recreation use will decrease the use of the Park, which is a tragedy.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathryn Nyrop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6656 **Comment Id:** 368252 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Your preferred alternative will significantly alter the quality of my life and the life of my dog, Sam. Spending time at the beach with Sam provides me with an opportunity to get to know my neighbors.
Organization:
Commenter: Joan M Kaplan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6554 **Comment Id:** 368616 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am distressed to again see efforts to reduce recreational areas for dogs - a reduction that, in fact, means reduced recreational experience for our family as we have a dog and a child that are bound together

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Austin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6529 **Comment Id:** 368710 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: With limited living space in San Francisco, the parks are all we have to exercise our dogs. Playing fetch, going for a run on leash/or off is vital to so majority of dog owners.The proposed changes will greatly impact the quality of life not only my dog but also myself and family.

Organization:

Commenter: M Mccright **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1444 **Comment Id:** 368773 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I worry that as the Park Service becomes more restrictive that this will affect the equestrians in more ways than the case that we can no longer ride with our dogs. There is something special about being out in the open with your horse and dog that cannot be matched by other experiences. I miss my dog when out with my horse and the dog does not understand why she has to stay home. I also miss the security of having the dog with me. Over the years I have had a couple of encounters while riding my horse when having the dog with me was what saved me from a bad experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Lyndall Erb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368780 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: VISITOR USE AND EXPERIENCE GGNRA/SEIS continues to arbitrarily value people who dislike dogs more than people who walk with their dogs. That is arbitrary and capricious prejudice. The preferred Alternative F greatly reduces the off-leash areas at Fort Funston from Alternative A. Off-leash beach access is reduced from 1.13 miles to 0.66 miles of beach, and the upland off-leash area is reduced from 98.7 acres to 17.6 acres. Yet SEIS says (page 1176) this reduction would have minor adverse impact on people who want off leash, and moderate adverse impact on people who dont want off leash. There is no logic to that evaluation. People who have been taking long walks at Fort Funston for years, accompanied by off-leash dogs, must give up that activity, entirely. They wont be able to do it at Fort Funston, nor anywhere else in the GGNRA, nor anywhere in San Francisco parks. They must simply give up a central portion of their outdoor recreational life. By any reasonable measure, thats a major

adverse impact for them. People who dont want off-leash can still go virtually anywhere in the GGNRA and not encounter an off-leash dog. If there is any adverse impact for them, it is a negligible impact. They have virtually all of the GGNRA at their disposal, and also most of Fort Funston. An evaluation of the impacts of alternatives on the two groups of people should include a credible estimate of how many people are affected. We know there are tens of thousands who go to Fort Funston for dog walking every year. How many dont go to Fort Funston because of the dogs there? One bit of data that would help here is the number of DEIS commenters that said they dont go to Fort Funston for that reason. GGNRA knows that number but doesnt provide it in the SEIS. It is only because of the acute prejudice of GGNRA staff against people with dogs that GGNRA could describe the adverse impact of Alternative F on such people as minor. Underneath it all, GGNRA does not consider people with dogs to be legitimate park visitors, while people who dont like dogs are considered legitimate park users.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6536 **Comment Id:** 368843 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The policy changes will significantly reduce public use and enjoyment of the GGNRA spaces

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6580 **Comment Id:** 369516 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA"s "preferred alternative" is definitely not our preferred alternative. It would greatly limit where Lucy and I could walk freely, together. I have walked so much on the sand, that I have actually injured my hip. It would be terrible if I could no longer walk freely with Lucy on the paths at Crissy, and had to be limited to the sand. I can't take her all the way to Ft. Funston and, even if I could, it's too dangerous for her because shes had two surgeries on her legs and the cliffs are difficult for her to navigate. I dont know what we'd do.

Organization:

Commenter: Gina Symczak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6604 **Comment Id:** 369525 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To not allow unleashed dogs in this area would be a huge disappointment to me and many others. Every dog I have encountered is under voice control and not llowed to roam beyond it's owner's control.

Organization:

Commenter: Brenda L Deluca **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6663 **Comment Id:** 369529 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many of the dog owners who spoke at the meeting were very concerned about what may happen to their ability to follow their habitual recreation patterns. A wide variety of people spoke: young men and women who are accustomed to run with their dogs, older people who simply go to a park to stroll either with or without dogs and spend some time sitting and socializing, handicapped people who walk slowly using a cane or a walker.

Organization:

Commenter: Norma Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6590 **Comment Id:** 369669 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Crissy Field Specific Issues The Preferred Alternative proposes to dramatically reduce off leash recreation at Crissy Field. This is a complete reversal of direction from the original Crissy Field Environmental assessment where the plan proposed to increase the acreage available for off leash recreation from 38 acres to 70 acres. Crissy Field EA p.10. The purpose was to allow for anticipated increases in the need for off leash recreational activity. Children with and without dogs, families, and other park users have all coexisted on East Beach successfully. The SEIS has not analyzed the impact on those park users who currently use East Beach for off leash recreation as they have for decades. The SEIS has also failed to adequately take into account the impact of reducing the available off leash recreation area for responsible commercial dog walkers and other park visitors with dogs because of the increased concentration of dogs in smaller off leash recreation areas. As identified in the K&L Gates comments submitted on behalf of CFDG, the shrinkage of off leash recreation areas impacts all of the regional and city parks by increasing the number of visitors with dogs to those locations. The SEIS fails to adequately evaluate the impacts on these park users and neighbors. Each of the governing bodies of Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo have raised their objections to the preferred alternative for precisely these reasons as documented in the K&L Gates comments.

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Commenter: Martha Walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

VU4005 Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Do Not Enjoy Dogs (Substantive)

1. **Many commenters are supportive of the plan to provide dogs with areas to run off-leash, as well as providing other visitors areas where dogs are prohibited. Commenters feel that dogs and dog owners should have adequate space to recreate and dogs should be able to enjoy the park; however, commenters also feel that following leash laws is imperative for the safety and enjoyment of all visitors, especially children. Restricting dogs will also benefit natural and cultural resources.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5 **Comment Id:** 337956 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to voice my support for Crissy Field maps 10f and 10c. These two maps achieve two important objectives: 1. It leaves a large area where dogs can run around off leash (ROLA) on both the field AND a long stretch of beach. Dog walkers should be able to enjoy sizable areas of the beach and field as ROLA. 2. It preserves East Beach for a place for young children and families free of dogs. East Beach is the most used area of Crissy field. My own daughter was run over and left with a bloody nose by a dog chasing a ball. Her twin sister had stepped in dog feces that same trip. The fact is that part of the beach is too heavily impacted as it is. Removing the dogs and creating a safe stretch of beach free of dogs is a fair thing to do for families.

Organization:

Commenter: Philip M Brady **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 101 **Comment Id:** 339936 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support the National Park Service in restricting several new spots in Golden Gate Park to dog use. Our precious common parks are not home to just wealthy dog walkers, but to quiet citizens who do not wish to be bothered by annoying and potentially dangerous dogs (or their owners); not to mention the many other living organisms that make up that ecosystem and without which no one would want to visit GGP in the first place. I urge the National Park Service to go ahead with restricting dogs from being off-leash in designated areas, and to disallow dogs altogether in ecologically sensitive territories.

Organization:

Commenter: Hale N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1003 **Comment Id:** 351402 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly AGREE with the NPS proposal to further limit off leash dogs and

areas where dogs are allowed. It is too bad that dogs spread diseases, such as the recently reported outbreak of distemper in the Tam Valley neighborhood, and are generally hard on the environment. It is high time that the National Parks started to defend the habitat within their boundaries, as the last remaining homes of many of our native species. The purpose of these parks is to preserve our natural places for future generations and these proposals are right in line with doing that. As our area has grown, we have decimated habitats throughout Marin, causing the disappearance of many of our native animal and plant species. As a long time resident of Tam Valley, I am appalled and saddened by this. Dog owners are a passionate group who love their dogs as family members and don't get it that dogs cause harm to the environment, especially off leash. I have seen all kinds of dog mischief out on Oak Valley trail and fire road, as well as Muir Beach. This includes digging, chasing animals and running through posted streams. Some owners are good about cleaning up after their dogs, but others think that dog poop is biodegradable and so it is "OK" to leave or throw into the creek, with or without bags. They don't realize that not only diseases, but parasites and medications are spread throughout the environment every time a dog leaves poop behind. Not only that, but the scent will linger and encourage other dogs to mark the same area. I know it is a difficult decision to stand by, especially under the organized onslaught by dog owners, but PLEASE stand your ground. Once this is in place, dog owners will just have to find or create other alternatives for their pets that wont destroy the public lands and their delicate environs. Thank you!

Organization:

Commenter: april post **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4084 **Comment Id:** 361260 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please do not allow unleashed dogs on Muir Beach. I went there less and less over the years as it became so widely known as a dog park, until I stopped going altogether. But recently I (a San Rafael native) have been making tentatively forays back to that area, enjoying immensely such things as the newly redone Dias Ridge Trail, the "secret garden" at the Zen Center and taking the Middle Green Gulch Trail from there, and the stunning Muir Woods and Muir Beach Overlook, and also, I went to Muir Beach itself while it was closed for restoration work and learned again why it's a such a gem. There is no reason that it should only be enjoyed by people who like unknown wet dogs bounding up to them and their tots (not to mention the effects of dogs on the habitat/wildlife). I know other people like myself who have stopped going there because it is overrun with dogs. Please, please, please, I am begging you, no unleashed dogs at Muir Beach. It's gorgeous, and I have a right to go there without fear of loose dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Rameen Moezzi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4118 **Comment Id:** 362043 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA provides a huge variety of visitor experiences, and well-regulated dog use should be one of them. Right now, the overwhelming presence of dogs on some beaches is effectively excluding any other use, creating a significant imbalance in user experiences. The marginal benefits of uncontrolled dog use, versus on leash, for the dog users is far less than the

major degradation of benefits to the non-dog users, caused by the wide-ranging impacts of the uncontrolled dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: greg norby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Several commenters stated that they are scared of dogs and feel that allowing dogs in the park limits access to these people.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366947 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Allowing pets along the eastern section of the Lands End Coastal Trail, as permitted under Alternative F, will not provide visitors more than a handful of short trails in the Lands End area where one could experience the area without the presence of dogs. Please adopt Alternative D for the Lands End area.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6459 **Comment Id:** 368528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There was an agreement by all parties in the Neg-Reg process that park visitors who desired to have a no dog experience of the park should be able to do so conveniently. It is our belief that the preferred alternative does not meet this goal in all areas, particularly in the portions of the park within San Francisco. We would encourage further examination and expansion of opportunities for those people desiring an experience of the richness of this park without encountering canines to be able to do so.

Organization: San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Commenter: Steven Krefting **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6678 **Comment Id:** 369615 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS does not provide enough consideration for the negative experiences park users have when confronted with an off-leash dog. Even on-leash dog walkers have expressed discomfort with off-leash dogs. In 2005, Congresswoman Jackie Speier stated, after having worked with dog owner organizations and GGNRA officials regarding off-leash behavior for years, that: Off-leash activity should be in areas that do not involve interaction with leashed dogs, or a fragile environment; i.e., the area should be fenced and properly noticed as to its use. For example, according to dog park experts, canine dominance factors preclude the placement of tables in dog parks-dogs jump on tables to be dominant-and problems will arise when a leashed dog is confronted by a free dog(18). Recently, at a meeting organized by Congresswoman Speier, she stated that her position on this issue had not changed(19). It is clear that in order to accommodate all park users, off-leash dogs must not be able to roam free and bother, harass, and even injure other visitors and their dogs. Enclosing all off-leash dog areas is the only way to

sufficiently deal with this issue, as discussed below.

Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Commenter: Laura Horton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Several commenters would like to see stricter leash laws for the safety of park visitors. Commenters feel that any area that allows off leash dogs becomes a dog park and loses its value to visitors who do not have dogs.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 2002 **Comment Id:** 354374 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a dog owner, I am all for more laws that keep dogs on leash. On more than one occasion in more than one park , I have been jumped on , knocked over and snapped at by off leash dogs. At each of these incidents I was told their dog just wants to play, or that the dog is friendly. The truth is that nothing would have occurred if their friendly playful dog been on leash. I would not have been knocked down , jumped on, or snapped at because the owner of the dog would have had control of the dog on a leash. I hope to be able to enjoy the parks with my dog on leash, knowing that other dogs will be on a leash also.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Connolly **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2004 **Comment Id:** 354673 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In general, dogs running wild off-leash enjoying their freedom by default means that others occupying these areas do not have the freedom to enjoy them without the influence of the dogs. If dogs are on the beach without a leash, whether or not in "voice control," the beach seems to be effectively ceded to be a dog beach, particularly with no definition of voice control and no enforcement of what rules exist at present. Those who might want to enjoy the beauty and serenity of the open space are consequently prevented from doing so.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2558 **Comment Id:** 359083 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been abused by dog walkers who think they have the right to let their dogs run free over the rights of people who would like to use these public areas. I do not like strange dogs of varies sizes running up, jumping on, sniffing me. On one occasion a dog stole a sandwich from my young son, I have seen children playing soccer step in dog poop bc many dog owners are irresponsible. Because of this, please enforce new rules that will make all public areas safe for more than just dog owners and their dogs.. I do not support off-leash areas .

Organization:
Commenter: Laura Milvy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

4. **One commenter states that although she has had several negative experiences with dogs in Golden Gate National Recreation Area, she does not want the NPS to limit use of the park for dogs. Instead, the commenter feels that the NPS should focus funding and efforts on enforcing the existing laws.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6324 **Comment Id:** 365610 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am writing to support no changes be made to your current dog regulations on your properties. Having said that, I would also like to emphasize that I do not enjoy sharing many of these trails with dogs. The reason I don't enjoy sharing the trails with dogs is because some of their owners have taken the attitude that the laws/rules do not apply to them. In particular, picking up after their dogs and maintaining their dogs in control. I routinely walk your trails in Marin county with a small child and have to avoid excrement left behind in and out of bags by the owners. Have been trampled on my picnic blanket with my child by dogs not under voice control or on a leash. I have even had a dog urinate on us while on a pic-nic. Even though, I have had several bad experiences with dogs on trails I do not want to fault the many good owners for the mistakes and bad behavior of few. I would like to encourage the National Park Services to spend more resources enforcing the current laws/rules. Dog owners who can not or will not pick up after their dogs should pay a fine. I also believe that owners who blatantly walk on trails that are not currently dog friendly should also face a fine. I realize enforcement would be costly, but enforcing a total ban would also be very costly.

Organization:
Commenter: Anita Sparks **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Other Comments:

Correspondence Id: 10 **Comment Id:** 337965 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off leash dogs dominate areas where they're permitted. They disturb and chase runners, hikers and brds alike. Muir beach is no longer used by residents without dogs because of the dogs roaming, sniffing, digging and pooping and their irreponsible owners inconsiderate behavior. Public properties that are allowed to become off leash areas become only suitable for dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 14 **Comment Id:** 337971 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Unless the NPS enforces the dog rules, many of the dog owners allow their pets to spoil the experience for the visitors, environment, and wildlife. 36 CFR Â§ 2.15 - The sections of the NPS pet regulation that prohibit: -Failing to dispose of pet excrement *nice word for raw sewage left on our park jewels* 36 CFR Â§ 2.1 - The regulation to preserve natural, cultural and archeological resources which prohibits possessing, destroying, injuring, defacing, removing, digging or disturbing wildlife, fish, plants or cultural or archeological resources. 36 CFR Â§ 2.2 - The regulation to protect wildlife that prohibits the feeding, touching, teasing, frightening or intentional disturbing of wildlife nesting, breeding or other activities. 36 CFR Â§ 2.34(a)(4) - The regulation regarding disorderly conduct which prohibits creating hazardous or physically offensive conditions.

Organization:

Commenter: l. ru **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 17 **Comment Id:** 337975 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This hugely successful and beautiful system was not developed for the selfish gain of a few outspoken dog lovers whose idea of a gently & loving "fido" does not extend beyond their close group of friends & fellow dog lovers. Not everyone is excited by the site of an unleashed dog or an over friendly one eiter. Nobody wants to sit where dogs have had their run of things, and small children are especially at risk to all the vulnerabilities that unrestricted access brings. Anything can happen at any time; not everyone enjoys the uninvited canine experience that these groups are asking for. Please maintain the controls that you are proposing. They are more than adequate and frankly more than these groups should reasonably expect. National parks are not open/unrestricted dog runs. Thank you again for you continued efforts to serve the whole community and outside visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 32 **Comment Id:** 337995 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It is my opinion that the NPS Preferred Alternative F is the best alternative for the Draft Dog Management Plan. I would like to know that the natural, cultural, and wildlife aspects of all of the areas described are protected for future generations. I believe visitors to these areas have the right to be safe from unruly dogs and/or their owners. I know that most dog owners are responsible and considerate of their dogs, as well as other people. I feel that dogs and their owners could benefit greatly from visiting all the areas discussed in this management plan, but there must be clear rules about when and where it is appropriate for dogs to be on- or off-leash. Of greatest concern to me are the needs of the wildlife that depend on beach areas for nesting, feeding, mating, and etc. As long as Alternative F is effective in providing such protection, I would accept it as the best alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: LeeAnn Bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 36 **Comment Id:** 337999 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I like that dogs will be required to be on leash. It is frightening to young children and small adults for dogs to come running up to them as they often do because they are friendly and enthusiastic. Dog parks are where dogs can run freely.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 41 **Comment Id:** 338007 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support the proposed dog plan, especially restricting dogs from being off-leash at East Beach. There are many children and toddlers who use that beach because of the easy access to parking - - a necessity with kids that age - - and running dogs (and what they leave behind) and small children don't mix well. I myself have had to defend my children from dogs running wild in that area, and my children were terrified.

Organization:

Commenter: Katy Olds **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 339914 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support the suggested more restrictive dog rules in park areas in San Francisco. Many areas, for example Crissy Field, are currently dominated by free-roaming dogs, some of which cannot be voice controlled. As someone who is scared of dogs, I find myself avoiding these areas and feel limited in my access to open space. In addition to the problem of off-leash dogs, I am also concerned about the remnants of dog feces, even after owners picking them up. It is impossible to completely clean up after a dog, particularly urine, which leaves off-leash grassland unusable for people (although some people don't seem to mind). The plan seems to reduce these impacts, as well as impacts on wildlife.

Organization:
Commenter: Heidi Sokolowsky **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 98 **Comment Id:** 339933 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please don't let a vocal special interest group determine the future of this lovely and sensitive national treasure. I don't enjoy visiting this park's open space very much - - and don't do so - - as I feel like I am going to a dog park, not a 'people' park. From dealing with dog feces and urine all over the field (ugh - who would want to sit down there?) to being approached by off-leash animals or almost sliced in half by folks' so-called long 'leashes,' neither I nor my children come here any more. Sadly, asking folks to keep their dog on a leash, even when told by frequent signage that it is to protect wildlife or the watershed appears to have NO impact, whether it is here, at Ocean Beach, in Golden Gate Park, or at any of the Marin Municipal Watershed areas. So I'd like to see one or two areas that are clearly 'dog parks,' since clearly we won't be able to NOT provide that, and have most of the rest of the areas be DOG-free and people/children-friendly. This park is a treasure not just for SF area residents, but also for our human visitors and animal denizens.
Organization:
Commenter: Caitlin N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 99 **Comment Id:** 339934 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I wish there were more restrictions for dogs, but please at least implement this. It infuriates me how dog owners, even if it's only a few, are irresponsible and continue to allow their dogs to run all over without having any control. Every time I go to crissy field, there is at least one dog who's owner has decided that it's cute to allow his dog to run and splash and then run over our blanket. This is a dense part of the city and shouldn't be controlled by a few vocal dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Exline **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 101 **Comment Id:** 339938 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is a common area, that should be reserved for many activities, but not all activities everywhere. Such indiscriminate use would foul the park and degrade its experience for users, let alone the land.
Organization:
Commenter: Hale N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 108 **Comment Id:** 343886 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Many years ago, I used to go regularly to Rodeo Beach. It was my favorite place of relaxation and recreation. At a certain point the number of dogs present increased dramatically. On one occasion, I arrived in the area near the cliffs on the southern end of the main section of beach, to find that the entire beach smelled like dog feces, something I had never noticed prior to this. I lay down where I usually did to relax in the sun. About 10 minutes later a large brown dog came running at high speed directly into me. One of the dogs sharp nails went into my leg, causing a wound which bled for minutes. The owner of the dog was a young man nearby who saw what happened and was very apologetic. In retrospect it made no difference whether the owner was nice or not - the over enthusiasm of a dog of this sort cannot be controlled. The bad smell and injury caused me to leave. I went to the ranger's office and spoke with a ranger, complaining that dogs were ruining the beach and that I had been injured. He said large numbers of dog owners brought their dogs there because it was one of the few beaches where they were allowed to do so, and he suggested I send a comment to the managers. I have never returned to Rodeo Beach, and as long as dogs are allowed there with their attendant dangers and stink, I will not return. I have recommended to others that they not go there - the place smells polluted with feces and the dogs are dangerous. THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM in these negotiations is that EVERYBODY, including dog owners, knows there is no way to have an arrangement of any type which is safe and sanitary for human visitors, as long as dogs and humans are allowed to be in the same place at the same time.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 113 **Comment Id:** 345831 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My wife and I have been walking and hiking in the GGNRA for many years and now walk fearfully each time. It's such a shame and really outrageous that we have to be on constant guard for uncontrolled dogs and their defiant and disrespectful owners. We now make sure to have heavy sticks to protect ourselves (in one case we had to protect ourselves from both the dog AND the owner!). We support the plan insofar as it designates specific areas for dogs (fenced areas would be best), a strong leash rule, that dogs must be "under control" and that there actually will be enforcement.

Organization:

Commenter: Chris C Highland **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 118 **Comment Id:** 345836 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I've been through the San Francisco proposals and generally I'm most interested in restricting off leash dog walking at Chrissy Field and Ocean Beach. Whatever the current regulations are, dogs are off leash ALL over these areas currently, even where they are clear signs. Many owners either do not control their dogs to keep them away from people who don't want dogs jumping on them, dumping sand on them or grabbing their beach toys or are simply not paying attention. I'm in favor of very clear areas that are limited in such a way that people wanting to enjoy the coast without unleashed dogs have an easier time of it. The other place I would wish to visit more is Fort Funston but unless off leash walking is limited there, I will

avoid it. Its overrun by professional walkers caring for groups of dogs. The natural landscape is a mess and its intimating to go for my family.

Organization:

Commenter: Danielle Conrad **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 140 **Comment Id:** 346302 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Personally, I find dogs intrusive in my appreciation of flowers, birds, and insects, so would like to have dog-free areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Libby Ingalls **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 349886 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We favor maximum restrictions on where dogs are allowed. There should be NO off leash areas. We visit SF and GGNRA, and find the presence of dogs, on- and off-leash and their waste a real drag on the experience.

Organization: Evogeneao

Commenter: Len Eisenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 192 **Comment Id:** 350075 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a resident of the Homestead Valley area of Mill Valley for over 17 years. I leave next to the Homestead Fire Rd as drawn on MAP 3. I use the fire road on a weekly basis and STRONGLY BELIEVE THE DOGS NEED TO BE ON LEASH OR BANNED ALTOGETHER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: 1. I have been bitten by a dog. The dog was not on a leash or under voice control. 2. Dog walkers routinely walk 4 dogs who are rarely on leash. I see these dogs run wild disturbing hikers, families, bike riders, local wildlife (Rabbits,birds, etc.), digging/crush native vegetation, and defecating on the trail. 3. I routinely see "plastic poop bags" on the trail unclaimed - unsightly and unsanitary. 4. I have seen dog on dog clashes. I get concerned the dogs may then turn on a human - adult or child

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 218 **Comment Id:** 350131 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I feel like I can't even take my kids to Crissy Field without a dog jumping on them or threatening them. Every dog owner thinks their dog doesn't act badly. Kids and dogs don't mix. Dog owners just don't respect any rules or restrictions on dogs. It would be nice to be able to take my kids to one place in this City where dog restrictions would be enforced. Because they are not enforced in city parks and dog owners don't respect the rules in city parks.

Organization:
Commenter: Sharon Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 256 **Comment Id:** 350369 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I do not enjoy seeing dogs when I hike. I hike a lot in areas where dogs are not allowed at all and I often see dogs off leash. I hike in areas where dogs are allowed but need to be leashed and most dogs are off leash.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 306 **Comment Id:** 350547 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: A recent visit to Chrissy Field felt like being in the middle of an off-leash dog park. We could not relax and enjoy the view. Dogs were bumping into us, kicking up sand and shaking water all over our clothes. In addition, dogs were chasing the shore birds and pooping in the sand. It was a shame that such a beautiful area had "gone to the dogs". Dogs should be on a leash in the majority of the parklands. Leash laws need to be strictly enforced.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 314 **Comment Id:** 350563 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am wholeheartedly in support of more dog management, really in *any* area of san francisco. I appreciate the rights of dog owners and their love for their companions, but having to avoid walking in poop, seeing dogs off leash charging at my children, and otherwise having to *avoid* dogs to just get around on the weekends is ridiculous.
Organization:
Commenter: jeremy toeman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 424 **Comment Id:** 351349 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As a runner, hiker and biker on the trails of Marin and Crissy field, I completely agree with your recommendations for those areas. There has not been a single run that I've taken in the past year on your referenced trails or beaches where I have not had a negative encounter with an off leash dog.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 584 **Comment Id:** 352674 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to voice my strong support for requiring dogs at Muir Beach be on leashes. I don't care too much about the Oakwood Valley Trail but off leash dogs have had a negative impact on visits to Muir Beach as well as damaging the habitats of native plants and animals.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Lubenow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 593 **Comment Id:** 352688 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to strongly SUPPORT any restrictive action GGNRA wants to place on off leash dog walking. My children and family are constantly harassed by off leash dogs in our neighborhood as well as other parks around the City. In Golden Gate park, Crissy Field, Dolores, Precita Park - off leash dogs are constantly coming up to my kids and licking and sniffing them. When you are a 3 foot child, a dog coming up to you and sticking his/her nose in you face is INTRUSIVE.

Organization:

Commenter: A concerned mom N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 617 **Comment Id:** 352739 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I believe there should be more dog-free trails in the San Francisco section of the GGNRA. When walking through the GGNRA, it's an everyday event to have an off-leash dog run up to you. Owners usually "control" their dogs by yelling at them. This creates an unpleasant experience for the non-dog-walking user of the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Kimberly Jannarone **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 631 **Comment Id:** 352772 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The current situation with respect to dogs is unpleasant and dangerous for non-dog owners and wildlife and needs to be remedied.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 744 **Comment Id:** 353101 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The National Park, like all land areas has a finite "carrying capacity", that is the number of people that can enjoy nature on a given amount of land. Dogs off leash reduce the number of people that can enjoy nature in the park. Dogs off leash drive people away from the area to seek enjoyment of nature elsewhere.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 770 **Comment Id:** 353258 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please severely restrict dogs on the beaches and strictly enforce the law. They should never be off leash but they are all the time. The dogs have taken over the beaches. They ruin the use of the beaches for me and my family, including our young children. We have stopped using the beaches because the dog situation is out of control.
Organization:
Commenter: David Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 774 **Comment Id:** 353264 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I support a balance of uses in the GGNRA, along with a strong enforcement policy that will make the park safe and enjoyable for everyone. I feel that dog owners/activists and commercial dog walkers have taken over large areas of the GGNRA and that the majority of these people seem entitled as if the GGNRA belongs only to them. There are other people such as seniors like myself who would like to walk and enjoy the GGNRA without dogs everywhere barking and jumping up on you and knocking you over.
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Betlach **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 775 **Comment Id:** 353267 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I love dogs, but I think dog owners should take more responsibility and prohibit their pets from running off-leash around wildlife. Also, some people (such as small children) may be frightened by off-leash dogs, so I believe that leash laws are important.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 859 **Comment Id:** 353447 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: At this point virtually all of the GGNRA is a de-facto off-leash dog area! Because of relentless political pressure, the NPS has been unable to enforce the existing laws. Some areas - the beaches near Chrissy Field, and Fort Funston, for example - are so crowded with unleashed dogs that their use for any other purpose is effectively denied to other park visitors. Exploring a scenic beach loses its appeal when the experience is reduced to a steady stream of uncontrolled dogs running at you, jumping on you, or sniffing your crotch.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 902 **Comment Id:** 353615 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I can't take my family to the Sausalito beach anymore because there is so much dog poop in the sand and in the water. My 2 year old plays in the sand and always end up with dog poop in her hand. This is disgusting. Thanks for helping with this and making sure Muir Beach remains child friendly (i.e. controlling dog's poop by keeping them off the beach or on leash)

Organization:

Commenter: Ed Rollet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 921 **Comment Id:** 353772 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please follow through with keeping dogs leashed on our public lands. When dogs are unleashed they spoil it for the rest of us, and on public lands I think the humans' needs should come first. It's the fairest option.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2019 **Comment Id:** 354691 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Too many dogs. I feel uncomfortable continually being approached by dogs, diminishing the pleasure of my vistits to GGNRA sites and feeling like I have to indulge their owners. Dogs should be kept on leashes at all times in public places. The GGNRA exists for people to enjoy. It's not a dog park (or a dog toilet). I am not satisfied by dog owners who promise to clean up their animals' feces.

Organization:

Commenter: Tom Zimberoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2270 **Comment Id:** 357290 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My family lives in San Mateo and we strongly support limiting the negative impacts dogs have on our open spaces. We live near Surgarloaf and experience first hand the feces the noise pollution and the limits dogs are putting on the use of the park for not just people and children but also the native species. I know dogs are cute, but I hope their owners don't bully down some sensible limits. Dogs are great in dog parks, back yards and homes, but in nature and parks where children and other less protected species dwell they are out of control.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2493 **Comment Id:** 358995 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support the GGNRA's plan to restrict dog access to vulnerable bird and wildlife nesting and foraging areas. The birds and wildlife have no voice; they just become extinct as their home is trampled and destroyed. I'm sick and tired of irresponsible dog owners who allow their dogs to litter the beaches and trails with dog shit. They ruin the area for everyone. I hope you do right by the birds and wildlife; their home territories are shrinking. BTW, I own a dog. I don't let her off leash and don't take her to any off leash areas. The one time I did, the place was disgusting. Every couple of feet, I found dog shit among the shrubbery and along the trail. It was truly gross and I left and have never gone back.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2513 **Comment Id:** 359014 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We support Alternative D. Off-leash dogs destroy the experience for the rest of us who are either afraid of dogs or want an experience that does not include off-lease dogs. Frankly, most dogs we have come across are not under voice-control especially when in they are with other dogs; they are unpredictable and/or not friendly. Dog owners too are often unfriendly and can be quite beligerent when asked to leash their dogs in on-leash areas. We shouldn't be made to feel unreasonable in requesting that they abide the law. Help!! Please protect us and the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5417 **Comment Id:** 363193 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs will not suffer from the dog management plan, only irresponsible dog owners will. I speak as someone whose child has been endangered by an irresponsible dog owner. Please pass and enforce a responsible dog management plan in any city and community that contains a human population.

Organization: Individual

Commenter: Jess Dines **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4467 **Comment Id:** 365352 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for ALL VISITORS. The situation at Ft. Funston illustrates how largely unregulated dog access can ruin the coastal park experience for families with dog feces underfoot, poop smell in the air and aggressive dogs frightening, even knocking over children. On one visit to watch hang-gliding, my granddaughter was badly traumatized by the sudden approach of a large unleashed dog. The continuing increase in

numbers of unleashed of dogs at Chrissy Field will eventually mirror the scene at Ft. Funston

Organization:

Commenter: Harvey A Ridley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366027 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The CFLR summary, like the Toohey and McCormack surveys, both also identify the substantial benefits that come with dog ownership and exercising dogs outside. GGAS acknowledges that and encourages the City of San Francisco and the National Park Service to ensure there are adequate opportunities for such activity. However, we also note that San Francisco already has more off-leash play areas than any metropolitan area in North America, and that its city parks are de facto off-leash parks. We also note that the GGNRA will be the first and only National Park to accommodate on- and off-leash activity to the scale provided in the Preferred Alternative. Dog owners will continue to have ample opportunity to benefit from dog-related recreation and exercise in San Francisco.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6457 **Comment Id:** 367516 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The beauty of the restored coastal areas adjacent to the Golden Gate Bridge are among the most beautiful and inspiring in the entire United States. My wife loves to visit this area and walk the path near Crissy Field, and I used to join her until recent years when this amazing place has become overrun by dogs. The entire experience of this area is now a hugely negative one, for me and many others I know who used to go to there to reconnect with the natural world. On weekends dogs running through fragile and protected areas, jumping on people, shitting on the beach and barking at their owners to throw them balls has ruined the experience of the area to the extent that it is no longer an enjoyable place to visit. Recently I had relatives in town and they wanted to go there and once I told them what a terrible place it was because it had been turned into one big dog park they agreed that this was not somewhere that we wanted to go.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert J Thomas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6648 **Comment Id:** 368222 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: At Fort Funston, I've often seen dog walkers with several dogs, frequently off leash, disturbing, even frightening other visitors, and in two instances causing injury! This aside from environmental damage they are causing.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim Morrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6459 **Comment Id:** 368548 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We look forward to visitors seeking experiences that do not include dogs to regain access to some of the amazing portions of the park that have been less desirable to visit as a result of unregulated dog activity.

Organization: San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Commenter: Steven Krefting **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6562 **Comment Id:** 368853 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a longtime hiker in the Golden Gate Recreational Parks and in other open spaces, I have noticed more and more the presence of dogs on and off leash in areas where it is marked NO PETS or NO DOGS. Frequently dogs run after wild animals and horses without being called by their owners. Several times barking dogs have jumped on me with dirty paws and the owner responding to my request to hold their animal was, "It is a friendly dog". surprisingly frequently dog owners do not pickup waste left by their dog. It is reasonable and wise that a small number of trails should accomodate dogs, but more trails should be free of pets and dogs, and enforcement applied.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Bonaventure **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6563 **Comment Id:** 368854 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs and dog owners are increasingly polluting the hiking and walking and running landscape. Stepping on dog poop is an every week, and sometimes every day occurance. Exercising, yoga, circuit training, playing catch, kicking the soccer ball, playing frisbee, are mightily constrained by the presence of dogs and dog poop. Dog owners and walkers do forget to clean up after their animals. Cryptosporidiosis proliferates.. dog barking has an unpleasant ring...dogs frighten away deer...let's eliminate dogs in public spaces.

Organization:

Commenter: Charles Dart **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6594 **Comment Id:** 368865 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I an for prohibiting dogs from being in the area. Just today 3 dogs came towards me (within a foot), not on leashes. I had to go under a chain fence; hide behind the NPS dog notice to get away. The dogs take away from the beauty of enjoying the wonderful scenery. A proir time last month the owner failed to clean up poop her dog left.

Organization:

Commenter: Helen Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6570 **Comment Id:** 369569 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Today you can encounter dogs everywhere in the park and it is not enjoyable for people that seek a quiet walk or want to enjoy birds and other wildlife. As a birdwatcher I no longer visit some parts within the GGNRA for example Fort Funston, because it is disturbing to see the dogs flushing birds along the trails and shoreline. Designated off-leash areas should be extremely clear to the public with obvious fencing and educational signage.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6672 **Comment Id:** 369595 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support the GGNRA's plan to ban off-lease dog walking on most of the federal lands. Many dog owners keep their dogs on-lease, however, as a senior and a walker it has been my experience that unrestrained, enthusiastic dogs are a danger to me and greatly lessen the enjoyment of walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Gail Lindlow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/18/2014)

VU4010 Visitor Use and Experience: Actions of Dog Owners (Substantive)

1. **Many commenters are concerned with the disregard of the rules by dog owners and dog walkers. These commenters feel that they cannot recreate in the park as they wish because dogs dominate the beaches and trails and dictate other visitors' behaviors. Because dog owners neglect to follow the rules put in place by the NPS, the natural resources of the park suffer and visitor experience is degraded for these commenters.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1313 **Comment Id:** 352292 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am very familiar with the Coastal Fire Road and the Coyote Ridge Trail. Over these last few years, I have noticed a significant increase in dogs off leash on these trails. There are no dogs allowed on these trails and signs are posted. Most of the owners are fully aware of the restrictions as many of them live in the surrounding neighborhoods that are adjacent to the GGNRA. The rules are completely ignored. Many dog owners view the GGNRA as an extension of their backyard and do as they please. Park service employees are no where to be found to enforce the rules.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4780 **Comment Id:** 361513 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As it is, I regularly see dog owners violating existing restrictions, letting their dogs off leash on trails where this is forbidden, and bringing their dogs into areas where they are not supposed to be, leashed or otherwise. These dogs then run off the trails and deep into the surrounding hillsides, disturbing any possibility of sanctuary for the wild animals who live there, and when on the beaches, relentlessly chase any shorebirds that are present, making it impossible for them to rest or forage for food.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Welwood **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5775 **Comment Id:** 364283 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I own a Greyhound that must be kept on-leash at all times unless in an enclosed area, due to his propensity for wandering. It's frustrating to responsible walk him on on-leash trails and come into contact with off-leash dogs and their irresponsible owners. More enforcement of these on-leash areas really is necessary to teach people that the rules DO apply and they must follow them. Without proper enforcement, people will constantly let their dogs

off-leash and nothing will really change from the past.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura Wilkinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **A complaint among many commenters is the harsh reaction they receive when asking dog owners to leash their dogs. Commenters stated that dog owners often admonish other visitors when asked to leash their dogs, even when the dog owners are not abiding by the rules. Many commenters feel that dog owners are disrespectful of other visitors.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1353 **Comment Id:** 352388 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, the dogs crap all over the beach (and many owners don't scoop), they chase birds (including threatened species), jump up on people that want nothing to do with them (and have destroyed my headset for my iphone on one occasion when a dog jumped up and clawed my chest), and generally create havoc. Many dog owners are responsible with their pets, but many are not. When I have(courteously) informed some dog owners that their dog was off leash in an on leash area, I have been physically threatened, verbally abused and harassed.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are a high percentage of non-compliant dog owners and professional dog walkers who provide false information or are rude and verbally abusive to the U.S. Park Officers. We are saddened to read about these incidents but not surprised based on our own experiences with non-compliant dog owners in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5415 **Comment Id:** 363185 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Unfortunately, although there are many dog owners who respect the laws, there is a visible and vocal minority of dog owners who do not respect laws or the rights of other citizens. These people ruin the park experience for all users - dog owners and non-dog owners alike. They give other dog owners a bad name, and honestly if all dog owners were respectful and aware of the needs of wildlife and other people, perhaps there would be less need for stringent dog laws. Unfortunately, too many of our San Francisco citizens will not respect these laws unless they are effectively enforced.

Organization:

Commenter: JOHN P Dumbacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Many commenters complimented San Francisco dog owners' responsible actions in keeping their dogs under control and keeping the park clean. These commenters believe that dog owners and walkers create a sense of community in the park.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1419 **Comment Id:** 352518 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the nearly 1,000 visits I've made to the GGNRA over the past three years, including frequent weekend visits to Muir Beach, I've never encountered any bad dog behavior. Instead, I see dog owners yielding to cyclists, other hikers, and beach goers; picking up after their pets; forbidding their dogs from going off trail; and generally acting responsibly. I've found the dog owners who frequent the GGNRA to demonstrate an amazing model of responsible citizenry and consideration for others.

Organization:

Commenter: Kaitlin Quistgard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4817 **Comment Id:** 361596 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have long commented that both dog owners and walkers are incredibly responsible with their dogs. They manage them, pick up after them and insure that their dogs have no impact on the many people who enjoy this recreation area and co-exist without a hitch. It is a social gathering spot that breeds community. I truly hope that you can let the park continue as harmoniously as it always has without uncalled for monitoring or enacting of a policy that the majority are content to leave be.

Organization:

Commenter: Minette H Nelson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5437 **Comment Id:** 363251 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Reducing the amount of off leash dog areas will restrict where I can take my dog out to run, play with other dogs and get some exercise. In all of the off leash dog areas I have been to in San Francisco, the one thing I have always appreciated is how clean and open they are. From my experience, dog owners who come to these areas pick up after their dogs, are responsible with their dogs and enjoy the opportunity to let their dogs be free to run and play. I've had nothing but positive experiences. The new policy seems to be too restrictive and will make it more difficult for me to take my dog out when I'm in th area.

Organization:

Commenter: Teresa E Ernst **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. **One commenter stated the importance of knowing dog behavior when in a public**

setting such as Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Stating a study on this topic (Reisner and Shofer 2008), this commenter noted that many dog owners cannot recognize situations that might become dangerous when dogs are interacting with children.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368390 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog walkers cannot be relied upon to control the behavior of their dogs to reduce the safety risk of off-leash activity. One study found that dog owners had limited knowledge of dog behavior and were unaware of factors that increased the risk of dog bites to children (Reisner & Shofer 2008). Many dog owners surveyed in the study who indicated that they were comfortable taking their dogs to public areas were making unsafe assumptions about interactions between dogs and unfamiliar children. Reisner and Sofer reported that 41% of respondents surveyed thought that it would be OK to allow their dog off leash in an area where they saw children running.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Other Comments:

Correspondence Id: 1419 **Comment Id:** 352518 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the nearly 1,000 visits I've made to the GGNRA over the past three years, including frequent weekend visits to Muir Beach, I've never encountered any bad dog behavior. Instead, I see dog owners yielding to cyclists, other hikers, and beach goers; picking up after their pets; forbidding their dogs from going off trail; and generally acting responsibly. I've found the dog owners who frequent the GGNRA to demonstrate an amazing model of responsible citizenry and consideration for others.

Organization:

Commenter: Kaitlin Quistgard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1422 **Comment Id:** 352525 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the hundreds of times we have done one of these activities, we have NEVER witnessed an unfavorable interaction between dogs or humans. On the contrary, dog walkers are routinely courteous and friendly. Nor have we observed any sanitation issues as a result of dogs

Organization:

Commenter: Peter Rogers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1462 **Comment Id:** 352828 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Furthermore, even on the trails that are supposed to be "on leash only" we still encounter rough and rowdy off leash dogs that don't hesitate to jump on a small child and owners who become indignant when we say things like," can you call your off your dog, he's afraid of dogs." It's become so unpleasant we've all but stopped using the trails, which is deeply frustrating since part of the reason we bought our house was it's close proximity to all the great GGNRA hiking.

Organization:

Commenter: Arianna Orleans **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1606 **Comment Id:** 353184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I see dogs walked off-leash in the GGNRA part of Mori Point each week. These dogs race off the trail and scatter the birds and rabbits in the area. When I mention to owners that the dogs should be leashed, even those that comply release their dogs when I go on my way.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 795 **Comment Id:** 353303 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: One of the biggest hypocritical attitudes I have observed in most dog advocates is their total disregard for wildlife. I have observed many instances of dog owners allowing their dogs to chase wildlife, especially birds.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Tremblay **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1705 **Comment Id:** 353668 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a frequent visitor to Chrissy Field, which is covered under this document, I fully support the clear rules around dog control. Even with the current system, which seems to let unleashed dogs in many places, dog owners are constantly ignoring all the signs and letting dogs roam and dig everywhere and bother non dog users of the park when they are purposely using areas not allowed for dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1725 **Comment Id:** 353701 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As soon as we enter the westbound or northbound section of our footprint, offleash dogs are everywhere, often barking, running up to kids and pooping everywhere, I mean everywhere. There is a heavily used unloading zone on the north side of our building that is really used as a big poop pit. It is very sad to see the park disrespected and full of dog poop and trash. Even more than that, it is sad to see the off-leash walkers and up to 20 dogs in tow trampling through the restored native plant regions that we use to teach, even more frustrating is dog walkers interrupting our programming of kids in the middle of a game, or exploring the sand/beach for the first time in their life, and the walkers asking us to 'move our kids' out of the way b/c "this is an off-leash dog park" and "can't we go somewhere else".

Organization: SFUSD Environmental Science Center

Commenter: Lisa Wojcik **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1766 **Comment Id:** 353748 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Unfortunately due to some fog owners who careless about others, it is a great initiative to restrain off-leash of dogs in public spaces. I had dog bite my 6 YO and the reply I got was: "nothing I can do about it". Or, stepped more than once on dog feces in the beach or our community park and garden.

Organization:

Commenter: Yoram N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1846 **Comment Id:** 354346 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: So I must speak for the wildlife. I am asking you to please not give in to the loudest fraction of San Franciscans who feel entitled to force their choices on nature and the rest of the city. I love dogs; they have been a part of my home and my life. But dogs need their own fenced-off space to be dogs, and their guardians must be responsible and follow the law- -with consequences if they don't. There must be justice for nature.

Organization:

Commenter: G M **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1868 **Comment Id:** 354398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog owners rarely have their dogs on leashes in the Protected Area and I have witnessed increasing numbers of dogs harassing the Snowy Plovers and other birds. In some instances, I have also witnessed dog owners encourage their dogs to chase birds in the Protection Area as a play thing for enjoyment. Dog owners usually become confrontational when made aware of the Protected Area's on-leash and no-harrasment policies, and they usually do not seem to be aware of the Park's policies in the Protected Area or do not seem to be concerned, especially given the lack of enforcement.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1875 **Comment Id:** 354416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Just today, I returned to Crissy Beach East with my two young children (2 and 4 years old) and was again, bombarded by at least 4 off-leash dogs whose owners had no voice control over their behavior; these dogs' behavior included urinating on my children's toys, digging through our backpacks and picnic basket for food and growling and threatening myself and my children when I attempted to shoo them away. And these same self-righteous dog owners threatened to call animal protective services on me for trying to protect my property and my children from their dogs. I told them that if they did not have control over their dogs, they need to be leashed. They only finally left with their dogs when I said that I would be happy to call the authorities for them regarding their dogs' behavior.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Le **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1980 **Comment Id:** 354644 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are people who are afraid of dogs and those people have to right to know that they can go to places where there will be no dogs or at least know that the dogs will be on leash and in COMMAND and CONTROL of their owners. Many a person who is fearful of dogs have become so due to the lack of control or lack of a leash. It would be wonderful if parents could be assured that there places that they can take their child/ren to a dog-free place where the child could run freely. I find it disgusting that some dog owners go into tot play area with their

dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Naomi I Lidicker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2655 **Comment Id:** 354796 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs on leash areas are a farce. A large proportion of dog owners let their canines run free no matter what the rules are. Leash compliance on Ocean Beach is less than 30%!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2966 **Comment Id:** 355278 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am NOT OPPOSED to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Draft Dog Management Plan. It makes sense. In my experience, dog owners allow their dogs to run off leash, and have little consideration for vegetation, wild life, and other people who don't want their dog running into them. There are plenty of places for people to walk dogs, even off leash. And, no one told them to buy a dog. Please SUPPORT THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION ARE DRAFT DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Reed Rahlmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2973 **Comment Id:** 355293 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I've observed that the vast majority of dog walkers also act responsible for their dogs, we shouldn't be punished for a minority of people who act carelessly with their dogs. Those individuals who act irresponsibly should be ticketed or otherwise reprimanded

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: kerry lan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3886 **Comment Id:** 355629 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: dogs and dog owners in the San Francisco Bay Area feel they have an entitlement beyond what non-dog owners have. They run dogs off leashes, frightening or killing small animals, they soil parks and trails with excrement and block passage with long leashes they often "f org et" to pull in when you need to pass. I know this is a minority of dog owners but that minority is growing. I love dogs, but I don't love many of their owners.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: John Morrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3892 **Comment Id:** 355640 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly support The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the area is overrun by dogs. Dog owners do not pick up after their dogs nor are they mindful of families with children spending time in Federal recreation areas. Thank you for working to curb the demands of unreasonable dog owners.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Joey Goldman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4466 **Comment Id:** 356004 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I support The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management because there is already wide-spread abuse by dog walkers . Many dog-walkers abuse the leash-only rules that are already in place making visits to parks unpleasant for people and dangerous to wildlife. Giving them more access will only increase their self-rightousness.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Gregory Meier **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2621 **Comment Id:** 356914 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There I took under-served youth from low income neighborhoods on nature hikes so they could learn about San Francisco's natural history, geology as well as observe native wildlife. Many of these students come from neighborhoods where they've experienced trauma in the form of aggression or attacks by dogs. I was appalled at how many rude and harassing comments I received from dog walkers who got angry when I asked them to keep their animals on leash around my student groups. Dogs jumped on my students, knocked them over and at pieces of their lunch right out of their hands.

Organization:

Commenter: Thea Zajac **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2706 **Comment Id:** 357119 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It also means that every time I am out enjoying nature, I expect to be pounced on by an unleashed bounding dog. Big and small- -dogs act as if they can do whatever they want. Even if leashed, the handler seems to assume their dog is harmless. Or I hear the familiar words, "don't worry, he won't bite, he's friendly." That time, when the handler tried to call his dog back, that bull terrier ignored him and jumped on me- -twice! So much for voice control. How on earth am I supposed to act normal (and not scared) when I am absolutely petrified that I will get bitten? Whenever I go for a jog in the GGNRA, I know I will have to stop in my tracks and walk quietly and carefully past every dog so as to avoid him/her growling or chasing me because I am jogging.

Organization:
Commenter: Helen D Gonzales **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2745 **Comment Id:** 357165 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am in support of the draft dog plan for the GGNRA. While I have met nice dogs who are under control, While walking, I have been rushed at by unknown dogs, which can be frightening, especially for children. The dog owners, when they show up on the trail, often just laugh. I think this is a balanced plan that allows responsible dog owners to enjoy the outdoors with their pets, and yet protects wildlife.
Organization:
Commenter: Anna M Korn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2747 **Comment Id:** 357182 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Another huge issue is that there are dog owners and dog walkers that don't pick up after their dogs. Some don't pick it up and others leave the plastic bags full of dog poop on the trails. My students and I have stepped in dog poop on numerous occasions which could have been prevented.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2799 **Comment Id:** 357502 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Although dogs can be enjoyable to watch, and animate the park, I have witnessed numerous instances where out of control dogs have ruined picnics, disturbed Scrabble games, shaken wet and sandy fur onto unsuspecting visitors, and have generally behaved badly while the owners act unapologetic or even defensively when asked to control their animals. I am a dog lover and a regular visitor to Crissy Field, but it is an unpleasant thought to imagine the very place I will be resting my hand may have only moments before been used as a dog toilet.
Organization:
Commenter: Tim Wells **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3146 **Comment Id:** 357929 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The fact that the rules regarding leash restriction are not currently followed with regularity shows that dog owners in this area too often show disregard for the well being of species and habitats that the National Park Service was created to protect. Even with the introduced new restrictions to dog access, San Francisco and Marin provide more open space and beach access for dogs and dog owners than any other coastal city in the United States of which I am aware.

Organization:
Commenter: Michael W Saxton **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3213 **Comment Id:** 357987 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: What's with people not picking up after their dogs? They even act as if they will if front of witnesses by carrying the little obligatory bag roll on their dogs' leashes. One early morning, I observed a dog owner take a baggy out while the dog was doing his business. My baby in her stroller, me, and another man were the onlookers passing by. Once we passed, the owner and her dog acted as if nothing had happened and left the poo behind. Outrageous!!!! Dog people, you have a civil responsibility!!! Get over yourself!!!
Organization:
Commenter: Allison Madden **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3280 **Comment Id:** 358039 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have observed dogs in "leashed" protective sanctuary areas chasing deer, owls, birds and other wildlife, sometimes, to the owner's dismay, actually catching this wildlife in their jaws. After the wildlife has been harmed by the unleashed dog, the owner may put their dog temporarily on leash but there is not a mutual respect for the hiking trails, hillsides or wildlife there. Many dog owners here are actually offended when a person asks them to put their dog on leash in a leash only area
Organization:
Commenter: Sandy g Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3280 **Comment Id:** 358042 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On mount Tamalpais, rangers have to ticket off leash dogs all the time. Tourists come from far away to see this beautiful mountain and paths often are littered with dog feces and colored dog excrement bags that were left behind. At Stinson Beach where there is actually a designated dog beach area, owners allow their dogs to run down the beach in the "leashed" area running over a family's blanket who is picnicing, chasing birds or leaving excrement even on the "no dog" side of the beach. In asking an owner to please clean up after her dog, I have been told multiple times how difficult it is to see all the dogs going to the bathroom when they all go at the same time. Ironically, this is usually the case in a leashed area.
Organization:
Commenter: Sandy g Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3334 **Comment Id:** 358171 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog owners and walkers often disregard signage that states they are to be ON

LEASH! Some of the owners are respectful and apologize when this is pointed out. Some are hostile.

Organization: JeepNey Projects Worldwide

Commenter: David Tomb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3341 **Comment Id:** 358188 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I frequently and cheerfully asked dog owners to keep their dogs on leashes and have twice now been subjected to abuse including not just an angry tone of voice but also multiple unrepeatable expletives. This is my public land,, too!

Organization:

Commenter: Emilie N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3347 **Comment Id:** 358200 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a retired veterinarian and animal owner. However I am concerned over the irresponsible and intrusive behavoir of many dog owners. I was at an exhibit (not for dogs) and had to trip over ill behaveddogs and stepo over dog feces which were not picked up.

Organization: Audubon Society, Amer Veterinary Association

Commenter: Roy Henrickson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3349 **Comment Id:** 358214 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I find it maddening and irresponsible that dog owners often ignore the off leash ordinances that do exist and that are clearly posted. There are 2 reasons for this One, many dog owners have a sense of entitlement. Two, there is no enforcement.

Organization:

Commenter: Diane Bahr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3353 **Comment Id:** 358221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs should be leased in marked areas. Many dog walkers pay no attention to signs or keeping their dogs on a lease and under control. I am often blocked by dogs that jump up on me. As a 78 year old, this is a constant hazard.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy B Kenyon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3362 **Comment Id:** 358236 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I regularly go to Ocean beach to walk. I have never ever seen a dog on leash. I

regularly see dogs chase birds. I also have seen on numerous occasions where someone just buries their dogs poo in the sand!!! Excuse me, but little kids and adults like to dig in the sand. These people seem to think it doesn't matter.

Organization: Private user

Commenter: Cathy Ritter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3363 **Comment Id:** 358246 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is seldom a time that we are out for a day of outdoor recreation when we do not come into contact with dog owners who are violating the requirements that their pets be absent or on a leash to protect the wildlife that lives there.

Organization: Tax payer & Park user

Commenter: Don McLaurin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3397 **Comment Id:** 358319 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am also an avid birder. I visited the Sutro Baths last year when the vagrant river otter was there. I was shocked when I saw some visitors let their dog tromp along the waters edge, following the movements of the otter without regard to causing stress upon the terrain or the animal.

Organization:

Commenter: Elaine K Geffen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3398 **Comment Id:** 358323 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is also a fact that too many dog owners (I am sorry to say) are not very responsible and do not pay much attention to signage. Fido's pleasure seems to be their only value.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Anne K Kelley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3557 **Comment Id:** 359200 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And, in regards to the safety of plant and animal (including the hiking human) I believe that many people consider that themselves in control of their dog, but with so many dogs off leash - if every dog is only badly behaved once per visit the impact is be huge. A misguided dog stumbles upon a nesting area, runs up to a fearful walker, or digs up a young plant trying to grow. I live on the Panhandle and I hear dog owners everyday say, "oh, I'm sorry, he usually listens better," as that dog aggressively approaches another dog, or runs at a child, or digs a hole in pursuit of a real or imagined gofer.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3611 **Comment Id:** 359257 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Time and time again, I see dogs off leash in places where they are supposed to be on leash. I have learned that "under voice control" is a fictional state. I have seen plastic bags of dog poop scattered along trails. I have encountered dog owners who aggressively insist on their rights to break the rules. A friend of mine broke his hip after an off-leash dog ran in front of his bicycle on the Railroad Grade. The dog owners ran off.
Organization: self
Commenter: Eve Pell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3621 **Comment Id:** 359261 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It became evident in some parts of the park that dog owners did not respect the rehabilitation that was being done. I saw dog owners at Fort Funston deliberately toss balls for their dogs into newly planted areas marked for protection. On Crissy Field many dog owners did not keep their dogs under voice control and had conflicts with visitors and other dogs. My young grandson did not like dogs jumping on him, and the dog owners were not apologetic about it- - it was the dog's right to do so; what was wrong with us?
Organization:
Commenter: Amy W Meyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3724 **Comment Id:** 359415 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have never seen anyone that had a dog off leash that could not control the dog. People that can't control there dogs DO keep them on a leash, as responsible dog walkers
Organization:
Commenter: Ingo Orlamunder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3795 **Comment Id:** 359856 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Almost without exception California dog owners are very careful to be aware of their surroundings and prevent any negative situations from arising. In my experience dog poop is almost always cleaned up by the owner. I am at a loss to understand why there is such a movement to ban dogs from beaches and trails.
Organization: RETIRED
Commenter: BRUCE B SMITH **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3841 **Comment Id:** 359966 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Thankfully, since I first began teaching in our parks dog owners as a whole have become much more responsible. Unfortunately, there are still way too many irresponsible owners who just don't care or understand the impact dogs can have in our parks - and to make matters worse, the dog population has certainly increased over the years and with it, the number of irresponsible owners. The situation is only going to get worse if the rules are not enforced.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3934 **Comment Id:** 360082 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe dogs should be restricted in the Golden Gate National Recreation area, as in your original plan. I hike at Tennessee Valley often and now there are always people walking their dogs on the main trial to the beach, even though it is clearly signed "no pets." I own two dogs myself and consider myself a dog lover, but many owners appear to believe that the rules don't apply to them.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan B Kelly **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3957 **Comment Id:** 360172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I watched a woman let her 2 dogs run directly over Snowy Plover habitat at San Francisco's Ocean beach while the birds were there. When she ran back up to the board walk, I courteously asked if she was aware of the sign and the leash requirement, and how the birds were startled by the dogs. Without stopping, No, she said, didn't see the sign, and ran off.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Roberta Guise **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3968 **Comment Id:** 360273 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Baquiano trail near Sweeny Ridge - Off Leash dog and owner jogging by my girlfriend and I. He kept running by, but the dog stopped to bark and snarl. I put Sandra behind me and yelled. The Dog owner came back, grabbed his dog by the collar, then berated US! Like we wanted to get attacked!

Organization:

Commenter: Mike C **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3968 **Comment Id:** 360276 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Old San Pedro Road heading up near the three phone poles. A lady's off leash dog barks and acts aggressively. When I comment on the fact that she doesn't even have a leash

with her, she responds that I don't have a helmet. I respond with helmet don't bite.

Organization:

Commenter: Mike C **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3992 **Comment Id:** 360367 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have first hand experience with rude and disrespectful dog owners and dog walkers who care more for their animals being off lease and free to go where ever they want than the young children who use/share the Fort Funston area. Although there are some dog owners who understand that not everyone loves dogs or is comfortable around them- -and they try hard to share the space, many of them could care less about sharing the area.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea A Gormley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3997 **Comment Id:** 360429 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Each and every time we visit, I clean up after my dog and other dogs. I also clean up after the countless humans who leave behind endless streams of garbage. We are often one of few people in these areas and regularly report any issues we see to the rangers or institutions like the Marin Mammal Center, something that many other dog owners also do.

Organization:

Commenter: Jessica Teas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4574 **Comment Id:** 360665 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am compelled to comment on the SEIS because of yet another poor visitor experience due to unruly dogs during my recent visit to Fort Funston, Lands End, Surtro Heights Park, Crissy Field and Ft Mason for a geology class. Like other visits to GGNRA, this one was no different in terms of witnessing dogs eliminating themselves all over the park. I was surprised to observe many owners leaving their dog's solid waste behind in its raw form or packaged inside a doggie bag. I witnessed a person walking thru the Crissy Field fenced wildlife area with their leashed dog, despite the signage stating this type of activity is not permitted. I watched unleashed and leashed dogs lunging and jumping at strangers, who did not request, nor welcome, this type of behavior. I have witnessed this type of owner/dog behavior on many prior visits to GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: susan rowinski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4591 **Comment Id:** 361088 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When my dog was younger and still had some aggression towards other dogs, I would walk my dog in areas designated as "leash required" expecting that we would be able to

avoid conflicts. However, every day I would encounter dogs off leash. When I mention the leash requirement to the owner and ask him/her to leash their dog for its own protection, 9 times out of 10 they would not and indicate that I was inconveniencing them!

Organization:

Commenter: Tony N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4643 **Comment Id:** 361163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have lived in San Francisco for many years and can share the numerous encounters we have had with irresponsible dog owners who assume we want their unleashed animals jumping on us or our personal property in public places before we have to alert the owners of our allergies. Most often the response from dog owners is surprisingly not an apology but rather an indication that they are entitled to do what they wish even to the detriment of other persons.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4670 **Comment Id:** 361305 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Just like I would never allow my daughter to touch or bother wildlife there, I never allow my dog near any wildlife and only allow her to be offleash where there is no wildlife present and other park users will not be bothered.

Organization:

Commenter: Danielle Gensch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4672 **Comment Id:** 361309 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many dog owners in this city are inconsiderate and unsafe. They laugh when their dogs jump on young children and leave their dogs' bowel movements all over. If we left dirty diapers on the street, you bet there would be repercussions.

Organization:

Commenter: Vicky N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4712 **Comment Id:** 361370 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My 4 year old son was jumped in by loose dogs three time in Ft Funston during a trip to SF. One owner said maybe my son should go else where. Dogs can get good exercise on a leash without terrorizing kids. I have a dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian Mcbride **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4732 **Comment Id:** 361407 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a resident of San Francisco, and I am constantly worried about being bitten by off-leash dogs when I go to parks. In my experience, if there is one off-leash area, the vast majority of dog owners treat the entire park as an off-leash area.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4780 **Comment Id:** 361513 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As it is, I regularly see dog owners violating existing restrictions, letting their dogs off leash on trails where this is forbidden, and bringing their dogs into areas where they are not supposed to be, leashed or otherwise. These dogs then run off the trails and deep into the surrounding hillsides, disturbing any possibility of sanctuary for the wild animals who live there, and when on the beaches, relentlessly chase any shorebirds that are present, making it impossible for them to rest or forage for food.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Welwood **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4817 **Comment Id:** 361596 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have long commented that both dog owners and walkers are incredibly responsible with their dogs. They manage them, pick up after them and insure that their dogs have no impact on the many people who enjoy this recreation area and co-exist without a hitch. It is a social gathering spot that breeds community. I truly hope that you can let the park continue as harmoniously as it always has without uncalled for monitoring or enacting of a policy that the majority are content to leave be.
Organization:
Commenter: Minette H Nelson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4850 **Comment Id:** 361629 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I regularly walk in areas where dogs are permitted and have seen many examples of owners scooping dog waste into bags and then leaving them right there on the trail or path. This is not the exception, it is the rule. Anyone who walks such areas will tell you that they are littered with bags of dog waste which are not removed by the owners, they simply remain on the path. This is unacceptable and don't believe for a moment that an "educational information program" of any sort will help to change this well-established behavior
Organization:
Commenter: Rob Hughes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4875 **Comment Id:** 361678 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having seen the dog issue from both sides, I am sympathetic to the concerns raised by some members of the community. However, it's clear to anyone who spends a great deal of time in these wonderful natural areas that dogs are nearly always well behaved and carefully guarded by their humans. The city's most irresponsible dog owners, in my experience, tend not to frequent the GGNRA lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeremy G **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4897 **Comment Id:** 361720 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In a small lake this last weekend in Golden Gate Park, two Pied-billed Grebes splashed and charged each other in an early territorial display, a Snowy Egret, Great Egret and Great Blue Heron were fishing at the edge, and numerous American Coots were swimming around. I was looking for an American Bittern, a more rare bird that occasionally frequents a small bath of reeds here. This natural scene (and any chance of seeing the bittern) was completely disrupted by an unleashed dog that jumped in the water and charged the birds - the egrets and heron flew away and the grebes scrambled for safety. The dog's owner paid no attention to the wildlife and ensuing disruption; he was oblivious to how much this ruined the enjoyment of the lake for others. It is sad that such places of refuge for wildlife and small snippets of tranquility are destroyed by irresponsible dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4932 **Comment Id:** 361793 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having witnessed countless violations of posted NPS policies and flagrant disregard for the park environment by dog owners, it is most imperative that the NPS not only implement a strong Dog Management Plan, but also ensure appropriate resources for its monitoring and enforcement.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard Bradus **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4950 **Comment Id:** 361816 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Everyone I see cleans up after their pets, and most people carry extra bags to carry out garbage and dog waste that other people have left on the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea Greenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4998 **Comment Id:** 361904 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If there is no enforcement of dogs being off leash in specified leashed areas what point is all this? Every time I go for a walk/hike where dogs are supposed to be on a lease , there are dog owners who think that since there is no ranger giving them a ticket, it is OK to have their dogs off leash. Often I see folks with more than two dogs off lease, running in restricted areas, 40 Ft away from the owner. The owners cannot see what there dogs are doing and if they poo'ed the owners do not even know, or most times do not care. I've had dogs off lease run up to me and jump on me, and I am afraid of big dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahna Dominski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5031 **Comment Id:** 362024 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I support the preferred alternative and fencing of off leash areas. My park experiences have shown that dog owners do not follow leash and off leash restrictions. Just one example would be Limantour beach, where dog owners regularly do not follow off leash boundaries and let their dogs run freely along the beach. The trails down to the beach are filled with dog feces where owners do not pick up after their dogs. It was disgusting, and all the dogs on the beach does degrade my park experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Pete G Rowland **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5046 **Comment Id:** 362110 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have been a dog owner most of my life, but the attitude of dog owners in San Francisco has persuaded me not to replace my most recent very beloved pal. I just decided I did not want to contribute to the sense of entitlement many people have about taking over public spaces with little regard for children or for people who are elderly or disabled, or even other dog owners, not to mention the widespread reluctance to clean up after the dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Thomas W Metz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5076 **Comment Id:** 362159 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not usually walk with a dog, but do walk on Ocean Beach and Ft. Funston quite often. I find that dogs and their walkers are caring and responsible users of the GGNRA. I am happy to meet dogs and their owners. It just makes no sense to require dogs to be on a leash on a walk. It makes the walk worse for the human and the dog.

Organization: Sierra Club

Commenter: Robert G Donjacour **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5081 **Comment Id:** 362164 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My impression is that vast majority of dogs and dog caretakers are very respectful and and really benefit from using these areas, specifically off leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Athena M Barouxis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5183 **Comment Id:** 362515 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Responsible dog owners know when to keep their dogs on leash and off leash, and well trained dogs behave well when walking alongside their owners. More restrictive leash laws will not turn irresponsible dog owners into better owners, nor will their make badly trained dogs behave better - it would increase leash aggression instead, in my view.
Organization:
Commenter: Julia N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5200 **Comment Id:** 362591 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As recently as this afternoon, I observed 2 hikers in a county park in Marin County on a leash-only trail with a large dog off leash. When another dog walker warned them that a ranger was ticketing hikers for off-leash dogs ahead, they (with much shouting at the dog before they could get it to come to them) leashed it. Once they'd passed the ranger on the trail (we were walking a short distance behind them) and he was out of sight, off came the leash. Only consistent enforcement with fines large enough to be a deterrent will bring these folk to heel.
Organization:
Commenter: Trent W Orr **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5205 **Comment Id:** 362599 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you pass this we will continue to walk our dogs. The rangers who will be ticketing will be foreigners on our land. College grads from Michigan etc. This is not right. You will have to ticket, taze, arrest on repeat because we will continue our life style.
Organization:
Commenter: Kristin A Van Til **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5206 **Comment Id:** 362602 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have been so impressed by the dog owners that we have personally

encountered on the trail; they are careful to clean up their dogs' messes, keep control of their dogs, and respect the beautiful land that is currently open to off-leash dog walking. People seem to be respectful towards boundaries when they are clearly marked and help educate new dog walkers about the policies for off-leash areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Noelle G Gibbs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5222 **Comment Id:** 362677 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs absolutely love the beach: they are often not under voice control because they are so excited to be running in the dunes and along or in the water. And many, many times, I have seen dogs chasing the birds at the edge of the water, while the dog owners do nothing to control the dog's behavior. And many times, I have politely asked the dog owners to control or leash their dog, and am met with indifference, or "this is the first time he's ever done this" (followed by inaction), or occasional, grudging leashing of the dog

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5222 **Comment Id:** 362678 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not have an issue with dogs: I am not afraid of them (in general), and in fact would have my own if I had time in the day to devote to a dog's care. That being said, I am also a DAILY visitor to Ocean Beach, and am dismayed by what I very frequently see there. I live in the Outer Sunset, (Judah/44th Ave) and going to walk along the beach in the morning or evening (or both) is routine for me. And despite the signage at the entrance to Ocean Beach (where Judah St. would terminate) re: the Snowy Plover habitat, dogs on leash at this part of Ocean Beach are the exception and not the rule.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5231 **Comment Id:** 362737 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As is often the case in an area frequented by dogs and their walkers, there were many plastic bags containing dog poop, presumably waiting to be retrieved on the return walk. But the rest of us don't want to look at these brightly colored plastic bags along the beach. Dog walkers should be required to immediately put these deposits into some container that they carry so that they don't trash up this beautiful natural area, even temporarily.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Sprinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5231 **Comment Id:** 362739 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my experience, voice and sight control is not a form of control that a person, such as myself, who doesn't like to be approached, jumped on, barked at in very close range, or otherwise harassed by unknown dogs can count on. A person walking on the beach has no way of knowing which dogs on voice control are really on voice control and which are simply running around without leashes. As an example, while I was walking, an unleashed dog, which appeared to be part pit bull, ran out of the dunes, coming to a halt about 2 feet from me. For about a minute, it stood there, barking and growling and looking at me in a threatening manner. I froze, my heart racing, looking in vain for someone whose voice would control this dog and get it away from me, but there was no one in the vicinity. Eventually the dog ran beyond me toward the ocean and I was able to continue on. In a minute, two people, who appeared to be looking for and calling a dog by name, came out of the dunes. I asked them if they were looking for a dog of this dog's description. When they said they were, and I told them about the encounter I had with this dog, they told me that was impossible, that their dog had never threatened anyone, etc. and they accused me of threatening their dog!

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Sprinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5254 **Comment Id:** 362817 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have two dogs and have taken them to Funston and Crissy Field many times. Crissy Field in particular is their favorite place to go in the city. I've never had a bad experience taking my dogs to these places: the dogs, dog owners, and non-dog owners are respectful of each other and the environment. So in my opinion option A, preserving the status quo, is the best path forward.

Organization:

Commenter: Denis Serenyi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5264 **Comment Id:** 362837 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off-leash dog areas should have physical boundaries of some sort. Unfortunately, "voice control" does not work, as I've repeatedly seen in the GGNRA. The worst case I witnessed was of a young woman who ran into the water off Crissy Field to "rescue" her off-leash dog, then screamed that she couldn't swim. Fortunately, both survived on their own. More often, I see off-leash dogs chasing wildlife, unintentionally intimidating small children on the beach, leaving droppings that are never picked up

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5304 **Comment Id:** 362931 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I love animals, but when I have my own dog I act responsibly and obey leash

laws. Many people here feel that they and their dogs are above the law, and I don't see anyone enforcing those laws. I would opt for dogs on leash on most trails, but the problem is that no one has seemed to enforce leash laws. I feel that the on-leash rule almost never works, since no one is there to enforce it.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5304 **Comment Id:** 362933 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I've had dogs run full speed at me or at my children, and the owner ignoring me or arguing when I ask that they leash their dog. The more aggressive the breed, the more the person seems to argue. "My dog is friendly" they call as the pitbull is rushing at my child. If I politely ask them to put their dog on a leash while they pass us, the response is typically that their dog is harmless, and they would rather argue and defend their dog's character than to comply with the rule and my request.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5311 **Comment Id:** 362948 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs in national parks are incompatible with multiple use activities such as nature viewing. Dogwalkers often fail to observe leash laws and voice control regulations. I have often observed off leash dogs in flushing wild birds.

Organization:

Commenter: Marjorie R Siegel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5335 **Comment Id:** 362974 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Being able to take my dog to an area that allows them to run free and play with other dogs is not only fun for the dog, but fun for the owners. In my experience most dog owners are responsible and take pride in the environment. For those that aren't, education is key.

Organization:

Commenter: debi N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363161 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Also, based on recent personal experience and relevant studies there has been little to no improvement in the behavior of animal owners and acts of civil disobedience in regards to the existing rules are on the increase.

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363169 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Many dog owners whose dogs have acted aggressively towards other dogs or visitors flee the scene when an injury occurs or a complaint is registered. Many non-compliant dog owners are abusive to visitors who complain to them about their dogs behavior or their handling of their dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5415 **Comment Id:** 363184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Just recently my family was hiking in Marin County when an off-leash dog ran up and began aggressively barking at my wife, with the dog owner nowhere in sight. My daughter, who is under two years old, was visibly shaken and brought to tears. By the time the owner approached, with claims that her dog "never acts like this", the day and hike were already ruined for my family. When I asked the owner to please keep her dog on a leash, she became hostile, and barked that she said she was sorry, what did I want from her. I simply said that she should keep her dog on a leash in this area, to which she gaffawed and walked off with her dog still off leash. My baby daughter could not be calmed, and we had to end our nature walk.
Organization:
Commenter: JOHN P Dumbacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5418 **Comment Id:** 363194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I can understand that there are dog owners who do not clean up after their pups. I see more people doing this than not doing it. If I happen to notice someone leaving a mess, I offer them one of my bags.
Organization:
Commenter: Jessica Osegueda **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5429 **Comment Id:** 363217 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In the many times I've been to these parks, I haven't experienced any safety or off-leash dog misbehaviour hazard, dog to dog or dog to person. Dog owner's who take off the leash are well aware of their dog's need to be properly trained to begin with.
Organization:
Commenter: Ed Ramos **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5435 **Comment Id:** 363242 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I always pick up my dogs messes, and even ones that are not ours. Dog owners are a community and we are there to help each other out.

Organization:

Commenter: Ashley M Hiben **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363300 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Several times playing peacefully in the sand with my small children we had barking, angry dogs approach us, kick sand in our faces, destroy our sand castles, with us not knowing how far the attack would go.. bites? Each time the distant owner would do nothing- maybe lamely call the dogs name or look at us like we were the ones at fault for enjoying some quiet family time in a national treasure. Or even get angry at us! We often just went home disappointed and sad.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363301 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Stepping on dog feces numerous times. Seeing dogs putting ther feces on the beach while their owners are off in the distance. The new one- collecting their dog's feces in a plastic bag and leaving the bags in piles on the beach or on the paths. Not even the dencency to put it in a public garbage can!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363303 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Countless times seeing dogs chasing the protected snowy plovers down into the water. Owner does nothing. Very sad.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5522 **Comment Id:** 363897 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Most dog owners have trained animals who are on recall and do not pose a threat to other dogs, people, or wildlife. The few people who have untrained animals cannot be used an an excuse to ban the parks from all dogs/people.

Organization:

Commenter: Julie N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5533 **Comment Id:** 363911 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We've always found all of the dogs there to be very friendly and the owners are very respectful and pick up after their dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Jane D **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5542 **Comment Id:** 363918 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: All dogs I encounter on the beach are well behaved and controlled by their owners. I have not encountered any instances of dogs harassing either wild life or other people. If anything, human impact from littering and walking on the dunes has a far greater negative impact on the beach wildlife than dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Chad R Plummer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5562 **Comment Id:** 363948 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My wife and I are very responsible dog owners. We are vigilant in abiding with the doggie litter laws and keeping the park clean. In fact, almost all of the dog owners we've met there are equally as responsible.
Organization:
Commenter: Rick Matsuno **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5588 **Comment Id:** 363973 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have been nothing but impressed with the way people interact with others. I've run into more inconsiderate people flying kites than I have dog owners in the GGNRA. In fact, there were fewer than 20 reported incidents involving dogs in the most recent data released.
Organization:
Commenter: Colleen A McNulty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5606 **Comment Id:** 364000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm not a dog owner, but I'm not a dog hater, either. But at Crissy Field and Ocean Beach, the off-leash dogs can be a nuisance. I cannot walk without off-leash dogs rushing up to me, or having to listen to owners shouting at their off-leash dogs to obey them. I came out to enjoy the scenery and to watch for birds, not to have to dodge dogs. Moreover, it isn't possible to bring a very small dog or a small child to these places due to the number of large dogs off leash: the owner may think the dog is friendly, but the rest of us have to take precautions with the safety of a small child or small dog.

Organization:
Commenter: Kathleen A Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5606 **Comment Id:** 364003 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: While some dog owners are conscientious, many others fail to comply with leash requirements in certain areas, to clean up after their dogs, or to maintain voice control over their off-leash dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathleen A Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5606 **Comment Id:** 364004 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: GGNRA needs to educate dog owners about the damage their pets do when they chase shorebirds. I have stopped going to the southern portion of Ocean Beach (including the supposed Snowy Plover areas) because it is too upsetting. People allow (and even encourage) their huge dogs to chase shorebirds. Birds and other wildlife in GGNRA deserve to also have space where they can rest, forage and live without constant disturbance and fear of death.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathleen A Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5612 **Comment Id:** 364009 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are PLENTY of places for dogs to be off-leash in SF. There are much fewer places for native plants and animals to exist in relative peace, so I'm all for less off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA. While not a dog owner, I love dogs, but let's remember they are dogs. Not kids. Not people. And there are a large number of irresponsible dog owners out there who can't be trusted to maintain control of their dogs
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5616 **Comment Id:** 364010 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a responsible dog owner, I do not allow the destruction of habitat, disturbance of wildlife, or unwanted interactions with people.
Organization:
Commenter: Victor G Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5632 **Comment Id:** 364049 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I love the GGNRA and visit it often. I will not, however, go to any area of the park where off leash dogs are allowed and I will question the advisability of visiting areas where dogs are allowed on leash due to the irresponsible behavior of most dog owners who either use very long leashes or let their dogs off leash when they think no one is watching.

Organization:

Commenter: georgina j monahan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5648 **Comment Id:** 364068 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Voice control" is a euphemism for "no control" and unless GGNRA has insufficient funding to provide ranger services during the day, these abuses will continue. Currently, there are typically no rangers present even on popular beaches on sunny weekend days - this past weekend on Rodeo Beach, for example, between 10 and 1 pm, not a ranger seen, and many loose dogs running roughshod over sunbathers, picnickers, and small children. When conftonted dog owners are hostile and argumentative and deny any responsibility for their animals' behavior. I have been told at Crissy Field that this is a "dog beach" and children are not welcome (my son was trampled to the point of screaming because a dog wanted his sandwich).

Organization:

Commenter: Liza Wozniak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5664 **Comment Id:** 364094 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The off leash dog community has a long history of ignoring rules designed to protect the general public from their uncontrolled dogs. The concept of "voice control" is completely without merit in the context of off leash recreation in public parks. Not only is it irritating to have to listen to owners shouting at their dogs, the lack of formal training in most dogs makes the efforts ineffective as well.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5683 **Comment Id:** 364148 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am constantly impressed with the level of respect SF dog-owners give to our city, keeping it clean, staying outside of protection areas, and in general always keeping our animals under voice control.

Organization:

Commenter: Jill A Jepson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5723 **Comment Id:** 364186 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a dog owner Fort Funston in San Francisco is one of the few places we can

take our dog to run free. The number of dogs and there owners who use the park is incredible , and considering the number of dogs, the place is very well maintained. Most dogs are under voice command, and dogs get along well. If you remove this location from dog owners to use off lease, I fear the will simply go to other parks and beaches and let there dogs run off lease where they do not belong. There would be more beaches effected by dogs running off leash and the problem would only become worse.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Ruble **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5775 **Comment Id:** 364283 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I own a Greyhound that must be kept on-leash at all times unless in an enclosed area, due to his propensity for wandering. It's frustrating to responsible walk him on on-leash trails and come into contact with off-leash dogs and their irresponsible owners. More enforcement of these on-leash areas really is necessary to teach people that the rules DO apply and they must follow them. Without proper enforcement, people will constantly let their dogs off-leash and nothing will really change from the past.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura Wilkinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5777 **Comment Id:** 364286 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On countless occasions, owners have let dogs contaminate waterways by not picking up feces; have actively ignored posted signs pertaining to presence of endangered species; and have created situations in which both humans and dogs could be injured. When a dog is off-leash, it is unknown to the general public whether the animal will or will not listen to voice commands or if the animal is in fact of a more peaceful demeanor or not.

Organization: Concerned Citizen

Commenter: Andy Keller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5779 **Comment Id:** 364295 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I support the reduction in leash free space because too many dog owners are irresponsible when it comes to cleaning up their pet waste when they allow their dogs to run leash-free in public areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Nick D **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5792 **Comment Id:** 364310 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And it is also irresponsible for those that unleash their dogs in a LEASHED

zone. In our opinion they care more about themselves than anyone (wildlife, other people and other dogs). It is very understandable why they want their dog (who of course can do no harm) to go unleashed. However we think they truly do not understand the issue here. Responsible dog owner have alternatives to take their dogs to a place where they are allowed to roam unleashed

Organization: Napa-Solano Audubon Society

Commenter: Robin L Leong **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5793 **Comment Id:** 364315 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a dog owner and dog lover. I take my dog hiking in the hills every day. She has plenty of legal off-leash time in safe areas. I obey the law and keep her leashed or out of forbidden areas as required. She and other leashed dogs are perfectly fine following the rules and staying where they belong. It's their people who have a problem - not the dogs. I personally witness the frequency of scofflaw conduct among dog owners on a regular basis. The only way to protect these areas is to keep dogs out entirely. I urge you to protect wildlife and keep dogs out.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5813 **Comment Id:** 364353 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: One particular instance stands out while at Ocean Beach, San Francisco. While surfing I noticed a cormorant playing on the inside of the breaking waves, which caught the attention of an off-leash Labrador, I think. The dog chased the bird as it bobbed in and out of the water, ultimately, catching the bird. The owner's threats and commands to stop we're futile. After the bird was fetched back to the owner, I showed my disguised, and in response, the owner berated and hit his dog. In the end, the bird died.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5834 **Comment Id:** 364379 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: She loves being off leash (though under voice control) at these beautiful natural areas, sharing them with my family. We are always very respectful of the natural area (almost every dog owner I see is) and we make sure to keep a close watch around other people. We are also very respectful in places where on-leash is required.

Organization:

Commenter: Geoff Garinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5848 **Comment Id:** 364398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a father of two young boys living in the city, I get very frustrated by how a city of people is over run by dog owners and dogs who have abused the lack of signage to allow all sized dogs to run free without a leash. Many times a week when one approaches my kids, I am told 'he is friendly'. That doesn't matter to me...maybe my 1 year old isn't friendly because he hasn't spent a lot of time with an 80 lb lab and will poke him in the eye because the dog is pushing his mouth in my sons face; and who knows how friendly that un leashed dog will then be? I have been biten and harassed by all kinds of "friendly" dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Ben holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5848 **Comment Id:** 364399 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have owned dogs and am fine with them as a part of our city however, dog owners need to see and heed to clear signage as to where they can be off lease.

Organization:

Commenter: Ben holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5856 **Comment Id:** 364421 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Recently, however I have witnessed something like dog anarchy at Crissy Field and at Fort Funston, and seen trails blocked by the professional dog-walkers with packs of a dozen or more dogs. I have seen unsanitary, smelly waste left by a few irresponsible owners. I even talked with a neighbor who had a dog jump on her back while she was jogging in Fort Funston, only to have the owner blame her for the attack because she was running!

Organization:

Commenter: James R Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5903 **Comment Id:** 364508 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The vast majority of GGNRA users and their dogs are well behaved. In 9 years of using the park (usually the Rodeo area) on a weekly basis, I have NEVER had a bad experience with any dog or human.

Organization:

Commenter: Joseph Hughes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5905 **Comment Id:** 364511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am an avid runner and have had several incidents with dogs including being chased, scratched, and nearly bitten on three different occasions. This has happened along crissy field, baker beach, batteries to bluffs, and throughout the presidio. The reactions from these dog owners has varied from apologetic, to laughing, to outright hostile and confrontational. The last

being an incident involving a young man with a large male pit bull off- leash which I reported to the park police. The situation has become so bad that I have resorted to carrying dog spray while running. Although these incidents have been rare, they have the capability of resulting in grave bodily harm or even death.

Organization:

Commenter: Kavan G Manson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5931 **Comment Id:** 364671 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have been negatively impacted by off leash dogs almost every time I go to GGNRA beaches and parks. Areas are fouled by dog waste - - regardless of signs and bags being provided. People do not take responsibility to manage their pet or follow existing leash restrictions. I love dogs and appreciate the desire of owners to have an off leash experience - - however that experience should not be at the detriment of others or diminish my rights to safely enjoy the area.

Organization:

Commenter: Norman E Torello **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5938 **Comment Id:** 364677 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are already areas where off leash dogs are banned but dog owners ignore the rules and there seems to be no enforcement of them. I would urge that enforcement of off leash dog regulations be enforced.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert M Cullison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6028 **Comment Id:** 364997 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am careful not to take my dogs into areas currently off limits in the GGNRA, and keep them on lead in areas that require it.

Organization:

Commenter: Rhodes Klement **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6031 **Comment Id:** 365005 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I understand this means critical areas must be totally off limits to dogs, had no problem with that when with my dog and expect other owners to respect that as well. The suggestion that dogs can be adequately controlled is a fiction, both in theory- -very few dogs actually obey- -and practice- -very few owners bother to even try. This past weekend I was on public beaches in San Mateo county where most dogs were running free in front of signs clearly requiring leashes on all.

Organization:
Commenter: William H Hudson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6045 **Comment Id:** 365238 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Not all dogs are out of control, in fact, the majority of the dogs are very well behaved. It is not the dogs fault but their human owners faults for not controlling their pet. These are also the same people who do not pick up the dogs feces or if they do they leave the little bag on the beach instead of walking it to the garbage can.
Organization:
Commenter: Renee N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6055 **Comment Id:** 365264 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have also witnessed many dog-owners behave with careless disregard for whatever dog use rules might apply in a given situation. I have concluded that enclosed off-Â-leash dog areas are the best way to keep pets, people, and plovers (as well as other wildlife) safe from harm. The other solutions tried, which allow, for example, for owner discretion, or for off-leash dogs in designated open spaces, or for timed use, simply do not work to protect people, pets, wildlife and the environment. It seems that very specific, enclosed areas will clarify the situation. Enforcement becomes pretty obvious. If outside an enclosed area, the off-leash dog must be considered in violation, a ticket issued.
Organization:
Commenter: Eugenie Marek **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6076 **Comment Id:** 365328 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Every outing now involves being run at by unrestrained dogs. While these animals may have friendly intentions, that is not enough to ensure the safety of other users. I won't walk my own dog on leash there anymore - having been charged, attacked, and bitten by a loose dog (in another area), he doesn't like unrestrained dogs running up to him. While on horseback, I have been confronted by multiple loose, unfriendly dogs, with no owner in sight or earshot of my calls for help. I have also been verbally abused for asking people to stop their dog running around my horse's feet - despite my expressed concern for the safety of their dog!
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6113 **Comment Id:** 365431 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When we are out walking, I see that most other non dog owners react favorably to having dogs off leash. The vast majority of dogs stay close to their owners and behave

themselves. Most dog owners are very attached to their animals, care for them & clean up after them.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Schoen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6114 **Comment Id:** 365436 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I find it impossible to have a pleasant walk because of the many many many dogs running loose. Their owners stand around with their cell phones, talk with each other, throw things for the dogs to chase, but the owners DO NOT mind their pets. I love dogs. I grew up with beloved pets. However, I feel that I should have as much right to go for a walk on the beach or in a park as someone's dog. I do not. There are too many dogs and they are running loose. Even on park areas where there is supposed to be a leash rule, no one keeps a dog on a leash. Seriously, in the past at least ten years I think I have seen two dogs on leash, and they may have been about to be set loose or may have been just recalled and leashed.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie J Friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6114 **Comment Id:** 365440 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have also had the extremely unpleasant experience of having to stop, start, stop, wheel my car around in order to avoid dogs which were not on leashes. After endangering my life in order to save the life of a little dog running loose in a parking lot or in the middle of a street adjacent to a park, the owners appear and tell me that the dog is under "voice control." This is simply insane. Each time this happened, the owner would be calling and calling while the dog, either confused and lost or over excited by the traffic and running, just kept running away from the owner. In both cases, if I had not had great reflexes the dogs and possibly the owners would have been smashed.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie J Friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6114 **Comment Id:** 365441 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am so tired of having to tip toe around the edges of the beach or park so that I am not in the way of the dogs. I do not enjoy seeing them urinate on the beach and the delicate plants. I do not enjoy seeing them defecate and then wondering if the owner will stop talking long enough to clean up. Nine times out of ten, they do not.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie J Friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6115 **Comment Id:** 365449 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It's not the dogs but the owners that are the problem
Organization:
Commenter: Matt Richardson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6132 **Comment Id:** 365539 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I often walk on Chrissy field beach from the Chrissy field parking lot to Fort Point. Most days when I walk there, there are at least one if not more dog owners walking their dog or dogs inside the protected area for the Snowy Plovers. They do not read the sign asking them to stay close to the water line. They trample the plants, and the area where the snowy plovers like to rest and hide, with their dogs. They usually don't listen when I ask them to observe the guidelines on the signs, by putting their dogs on leash and avoiding the areas away from the water line. This is very upsetting to me knowing how vulnerable the snowy plovers are.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6136 **Comment Id:** 365593 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog is well trained, has perfect recall, is well socialized BECAUSE we get out daily. I pick up and dispose of 100% o my dog's feces and carry the bag until I find a proper waste can. We are the responsible regular visitors of the parks, respecters of the wildlife, and the park's eyes and ears - discouraging illegal activity by simply being present.
Organization:
Commenter: Ginny Lamini **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6142 **Comment Id:** 365601 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: During walks in the Presidio my dogs and I have come to the aid of an owl caught in barbed wire fencing. We alerted to Presidio post veterinarian who freed the bird and saved its life. We have chased off vandals, reported broken water lines and participated in various activities to benefit the park.
Organization:
Commenter: Robert A Dewey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6163 **Comment Id:** 365684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dog owners are responsible visitors, cleaning up after their pets, and others. It is often non-residents and tourists who litter, and the residents and dog owners who are cleaning up, in order to protect their dogs, and the ocean
Organization:

Commenter: Brooke R Rogers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6228 **Comment Id:** 366146 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are family and have the right to access these beautiful places as we do..with constrains. Its the idiots that don't teach and enforce good behavior that ruin it for everyone.... Please don't do this.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephanie L Perdue **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6239 **Comment Id:** 366161 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: dogs and dog owners are increasingly polluting the hiking/walking/running landscape. Stepping on dog poop is an every week and frequently everyday phenomenon. Exercising, yoga, circuit training, playing catch, kicking the soccer ball, playing frisbee are mightily constrained by the presence of dogs and dog poop. Dog owners and dog walkers do forget to clean up after their animal. Cryptosporidiosis proliferates...dog barking is irritating...dogs scare deer aw
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6241 **Comment Id:** 366171 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dog owners I see are are responsible - we pick up after our dogs, are cautious towards people who may or may not like animals and do not allow dogs to harass or encroach on wildlife. In short, I believe people with dogs are earning this access with good behavior and that we present relative little risk to the quality of life for wildlife and nature.
Organization:
Commenter: Christine B Brumback **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6242 **Comment Id:** 366176 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Regarding (1), San Francisco dog owners are by far the most law-breaking, inconsiderate, irresponsible group I have seen in years of living in cities around the world. Regarding (2), with the exception of border collies, dogs in San Francisco ignore voice commands. All you get is a bunch of owners making lots of noise hollering, while the dogs run wild.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6242 **Comment Id:** 366177 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Francisco dog owner behavior is that if dogs are allowed, the owners will let them off leash. There is no reason to expect this behavior to change. There are not enough park rangers in the universe to enforce compliance with leash regulations in GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6277 **Comment Id:** 366397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Even though most of the dogs are well behaved and are voice controlled it is common, almost daily, to observe dogs that are totally out of control; dogs chasing and fighting with other dogs, chasing after other walkers and bicyclist, nipping or biting people (this even happened to me as I walked to my office), and much more. And, it's not just the dogs but also the owners who don't pick up after their dogs, or if they do they leave the plastic bags lay on the ground for someone else to pick up. How is any of this considerate for others.

Organization:

Commenter: Fred Picavet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6284 **Comment Id:** 366415 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Everyone, even non-dog owners, enjoy having my very friendly dog be part of their park and beach experience. Before I was a dog owner, I always enjoyed the brief encounter with other people's dogs when I was outside.

Organization:

Commenter: Joe Sherer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6611 **Comment Id:** 367184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: DO NOT HAVE A DOG! But I enjoy the dogs and their very fine owners enjoying, as I do, the wild and full ambience of the beach. they are not harming any living thing, and their owners are meticulous about cleaning up their poop, as well as, cleaning up other detrius on the beach!

Organization:

Commenter: Sally Salaus **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6612 **Comment Id:** 367188 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe most everyone who walks their dogs in those areas are responsible owners and for many, walking there is the highlight of their day.

Organization:

Commenter: Alice Sakamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6613 **Comment Id:** 367192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It seems to me that most of the dog owners that use these areas are responible people who just want their dogs to be healthy and have a place to run in a city where that is not possibe in most places.My dog as well as most of the dogs I see there are under voice control.
Organization:
Commenter: Roberta Rovner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6621 **Comment Id:** 367470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Though unfortunate, negative situations will occur but are almost always covered by specific regulations that are broken by careless dog owners. To apply a blanket restriction because of a few scofflaws is inappropriate.
Organization:
Commenter: Dixon Power **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6624 **Comment Id:** 367486 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And because often people don't seem to care to take responsibility for their dogs, including how they harass other people or animals, or even cleaning up after them properly, I feel that dogs need to be nm only at parks designated for dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Heather Evergreen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367541 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SDEIS states that dogs harass marine mammals at the beaches. However, the Marine Mammal Center has relied on dog walkers for years to inform them about stranded marine mammals on beaches - - these beneficial aspects of dog walkers should be taken into account in all fairness. The TMMC wrote an email letter to Jane Woodman in 2006 stating this information and is attached for your information. The dog walkers are the first responders when these marine mammals wash up on beaches because of illness or injury and TMMC depends on these sightings so if possible, they can help the distressed marine mammal in a timely manner.
Organization:
Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6632 **Comment Id:** 367549 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA's users include not only tourist-visitors but also residents of all descriptions: parents & little children, parents with bigger children, cyclists, skaters, picnickers, walkers, runners, nature lovers, dog walkers both professional and dog owners (even cat & rabbit owners) and just about any other SF resident who feels like a brief stay in a beautiful park. Members of these groups are,,alas, at one time or another messy (drop trash) and destructive (cycling on grass, crushing plants, damaging structures etc.) A vast majority of dogs are well-behaved and their owners clean up after them and they don't drop candy wrapperrs, Saran wrap, aluminum foil, coffee cups and other human detritus that is o filthy, and ugly. (I have seen humans urinate & defecate at Crissy Field). Many people don't like children and elderly folks are scared of cyclists & rowdy ball/frisbee players, who probably also frighten wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: Louise Frankel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6640 **Comment Id:** 367566 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I live across the street from what is essentially a National Dog Park. When I take hikes through the park I'm frequently accosted by dogs mostly off leash. It's not at all like the experience I had in Volcanoes NP. While on a recent hike, I was immediately pounced on, by a dog. It's owner assured me that it was a "friendly dog" but it pushed me off the trail and into the bushes. I kept walking and passed numerous dogs running loose some without an owner in sight. As a hiker I don't know which dog is friendly and which isn't. I've asked owners to "please leash their dog", and the response in general has been quite hostile. During this hike I observed two owners that had their dogs on leashes the rest of the dogs were running free. I find hiking in this park, not at all stress free and often is unpleasant.

Organization:

Commenter: John O'Hara **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368115 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog owners have proven that they cannot act in goodfaith in the interest of cooperation to assure any other uses of public play spaces other than their confused belief that pets are not "children" and do not have priority over other uses and natural wild plant and animal sustainability.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6647 **Comment Id:** 368216 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I walk nearly every day with other humans and their dogs and am always impressed with how responsible people are with their dogs as we trek the hills and valleys of Northern California.

Organization:

Commenter: Tommy K Harty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368380 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The law enforcement incident reports are full of instances of owners of off-leash dogs not being able to recall their dogs or completely losing sight of their dogs leading to hazardous incidents. A few of the incident reports indicate that owners knowingly allow high risk dogs off leash in GGNRA, including dogs with troubled histories that are being rehabilitated for adoption or known aggressive dogs. Since GGNRA does not monitor or issue permits for voice control, there is no way to control the risk to visitors caused by such dog owners who have the poor judgment to allow such high risk dogs to roam off-leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6550 **Comment Id:** 368574 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is a travesty to wildlife and their shrinking habitat that dogs are allowed to roam at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Dogs on leash areas are a farce. A large proportion of dog owners let their canines run free no matter what the rules are. Leash compliance on Ocean Beach is less than 30%
Organization:
Commenter: NA NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4503 **Comment Id:** 368689 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: One of the highlights of my day is to walk on the path along the beach and watch the dogs playing. Most of the dog owners are very responsible and pick up after their dogs. I'm more dismayed at the horse poop that is left by the park police horses that never gets cleaned up. I'm amazed at how well-behaved the dogs are. i so enjoy their romping and chasing and running.
Organization:
Commenter: Helen M Kloepfer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6544 **Comment Id:** 368698 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In regards to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, I am primarily concerned about the lack of specificity and documentation of the negative impacts dogs have on the areas. I am often impressed with how well within the areas are organized by the GGNRA to limit the negative human and pet impact on the areas. I keep myself and my dog out of designated protected areas and observe that other visitors do the same out of respect, enjoyment and desire to preserve the GGNRA and what it offers us every time we visit. If the

negative environmental impact can be better measured and specified, I am confident that dog-owners can better participate in reducing or eliminating that impact while preserving off-leash privileges.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary-Lynn Garrett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6561 **Comment Id:** 369508 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On Ocean Beach and in other parts of the GGNRA, dog walkers follow leash requirements less than 30% of the time-meaning the vast majority of dogs in the park are off-leash and are not kept on voice-control. Every year, there are hundreds of incidents of dog attacks on wildlife, people and other dogs in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Marjorie Blackwell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6604 **Comment Id:** 369524 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have a home at Stinson Beach that I go to regularly with my dog. There are many unleashed dogs that I see on this GGNRATbeach and there has never been a problem in the 20 years I have been bringing my dog there. Owners are very diligent about cleaning up after their dogs, I have NEVER found dog feces left behind on that beach!

Organization:

Commenter: Brenda L Deluca **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6670 **Comment Id:** 369543 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The history of off leash dog use is that in areas where off leash dog use occurs it drives other park users from those areas because of biting incidents, the constant issue of dealing with dog feces that dog owners do not pick up, and the inability of other users to enjoy the park area without the presence of dogs.

Organization: Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

Commenter: Norman La Force **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

VU4025 Visitor Use and Experience: Commercial Dog Walkers (Substantive)

5. **Many commenters wish to see commercial dog walking banned from Golden Gate National Recreation Area, stating that the federal land should not be used for financial gain of a certain group. The use of the park by a for-profit entity that does not pay usage fees opposes NPS laws and regulations, as well as the park's enabling legislation, according to some commenters. Additionally, the use of public land and need for law enforcement personnel puts a strain on the park's already stressed resources.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 2417 **Comment Id:** 358917 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, I am troubled by dog walkers using national park land for commercial gain. All other commercial activities that I am aware of are regulated by NPS, pay usage fees, and adhere to detailed regulations. The nature of commercial dog walking means that this activity creates an additional burden on the already understaffed NPS,with no benefit I perceive to the rest of the public.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5415 **Comment Id:** 363187 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Commercial dog walking should not be allowed in the GGNRA. Other commercial enterprises typically must go through review to evaluate their impacts, benefits, and alignment with the parks' mission. This has not been done for commercial dog walking. Furthermore, commercial dog walking - often with many dogs in tow - can have a greater impact on trails, wildlife and other users than is fair. And this is not a recreational activity - it is a commercial activity that does not align with park values or mission.

Organization:

Commenter: JOHN P Dumbacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366033 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not justify why commercial dog walking (CDW) is included as a component of the Preferred Alternative. A proper evaluation should examine whether commercial dog walking is consistent with applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies, which in this case include the Organic Act, the GGNRA enabling legislation, the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998, the National Environmental Policy Act, NPS

Management Policies 2006, and Director's Order #53. While some may argue that dog walking is part of the mission of the GGNRA and was intrinsic in the "values or purposes for which the park was established", no one can credibly argue that the commercial enterprise of dog walking-i.e., walking a dog that you do not own for financial gain-can in any way be considered part of the GGNRA's mission or core values or purposes. Commercial dog walking does not meet the criteria to be authorized as an appropriate activity for national parklands. It constitutes a commercial exploitation of park resources (both in environmental impacts and personnel to manage the activity). To our knowledge, commercial dog walking is not allowed in any other unit of the National Park System. Rather, where commercial activities are allowed, they are permitted only to the extent that they provide for or enhance park visitor experiences. Commercial dog walking does not provide any park enhancement benefit. At a minimum, the SEIS must be revised to demonstrate how this commercial activity complies with applicable laws and regulations.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366922 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Commercial dog walking should not be included as a component of whatever alternative is adopted. Commercial dog-walking constitutes an economic use of park lands that is not permitted by the NPS's Organic Act, the GGNRA enabling legislation, the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998, the National Environmental Policy Act, NPS Management Policies 2006, and Director's Order #53. Commercial activities within the National Parks are allowed only to the extent that they support the park mission to protect resources and enhance the visitor experience. Commercial dog-walking constitutes a use of the public land that puts a drain on park resources without any financial or mission-oriented returns for the Park Service.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368117 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Do not make the same mistake as the SF Rec. & Park Dept. has made by fearing the misperception of dog owner political power and not enforce dog use. As it is now, RPD staff (gardeners, managers, recreation directors) is instructed to not confront dog owners when they violate Park Codes, yet welcome private residents to "self-police" and take the brunt of dog owner rage at being told they must stop bad behavior in local parks and playgrounds. The number of Park Ranger officers is very low and enforcing dog rules has deliberately been virtually ignored. Commercial dog walkers should prove easily visible training, licensing, and with proper personally supplied cleaning materials versus taxes paid for and supplied.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

6. **Commenters are concerned about the number of dogs allowed per commercial dog walker at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, both leashed and unleashed. Commenters stated that commercial dog walkers are unable to control and clean up after numerous dogs at once. When off leash, the dogs are a larger disruption to other visitors and most often not under voice control. Many commenters would prefer the number of dogs to be limited to fewer than 6 per dog walker.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 2507 **Comment Id:** 359006 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Limiting the number the number of dogs per walker is important to public safety and, potentially, to protecting the Park against liability. However, a large pack (and most dog walkers have 8 or more dogs) may have two or more aggressive dogs, and when that happens they behave like a hunting pack, circling an individual so that only one dog can be faced at a time. Furthermore, a group of dogs will behave far more aggressively than an individual. All of this is in addition to the difficulty of controlling a large group. The current sizes of dogs groups with a single walker make the park experience risky and unpleasant for other users, and frequently for other dog walkers.

Organization:

Commenter: John P Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4795 **Comment Id:** 361550 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The only restrictions on dog walking that could be justified would be to limit the amount of dogs that professional dog walkers can walk at a time. Virtually all the negative impacts from dog walking I observe are when professional dog walkers are walking groups of over six dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Kenji Okamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1716 **Comment Id:** 353684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are part of that community, and these areas represent logical places for dog walking. But the number of off-leash dogs has become unsustainable, and commercial dog walkers are abusing their free access to these areas. The limit of six dogs/person is especially important, as is enforcement of leash laws in sensitive wildlife areas. I believe that voice control of off-leash dogs is rarely happening.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1811 **Comment Id:** 354135 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In Sum, the tighter the restrictions on dog walkers, private or commercial, the better. In particular, commercial dog walkers should be heavily restricted - they have 10 dogs at

times and let them off leash at times. Sometimes there is more than one commercial dog walker at same location. When requested to control animals, they are rude and claim they are not subject to regulations.

Organization:

Commenter: arnold schuster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

7. **Commenters are concerned about the effects the proposed limits will have on commercial dog walkers and other dog-related businesses in the San Francisco area. Several commenters expressed concerns that being able to service fewer clients per day would put them out of business.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 154 **Comment Id:** 349883 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: With regard to commercial dog walking operations (and the like), there are over 400 such businesses in San Francisco. Yelp.com currently lists 414. By simple extrapolation, that's a lot of dogs, and a good number of robust businesses that rely on public land, open space, and off leash areas in order to operate. Further restricting use of GGNRA managed lands will have a negative effect on local business. I fear that with further land use restriction and permit bureaucracy I may have to close my own business, because increasing rates unsustainably and limiting my group size to 6 will push me out of business.

Organization: Seth Green Canine Care

Commenter: Seth Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1071 **Comment Id:** 368728 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: NO STUDY TO SUPPORT Restricting Dog Walkers Pack Size to 6. There should be some reasonable restrictions on the number of dogs that dog walkers are allow to walk off-leash at one time. I agree that 15-20 at a time is too many. However, I do believe that your suggest number limited to 6 is impractical and unfair. The San Francisco city supervisors already reviewed this issue and concluded in 2012 that restricting the number to 8 makes it possible for dog walkers to make a living wage. Below that number, it would be really hard to live in this city. Dog walkers in San Francisco play a vital role in helping families to be able to own a pet that brings them such unbelievable happiness and joy. Restricting dog walkers to fewer than 8 dogs off-leash impacts our ability to make a living wage and provide this service to San Francisco families. Matching the city park limits is the best decision for all concerned and the supervisors and Mayor Ed Lee have all voiced their concerns that if you do not match the city, you will be causing impact to nearby city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Janet Slissman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

8. Several commenters are concerned about different limits on dog walking being set up for Golden Gate National Recreation Area, stating that setting different standards for different visitors is discriminatory. The commenters suggest that all visitors be governed under the same regulations.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 4256 **Comment Id:** 368465 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Preferred Alternative is discriminatory in that it establishes two different standards for the allowed number of dogs per walker. All dog walkers within the GGNRA should be equally limited to a number of dogs that can be reasonably managed in a manner which is consistent with all applicable laws, regulations, executive orders, and management policies. Establishing a policy under which some park visitors are permitted to walk more dogs than other park visitors is clearly discriminatory. Establishing two separate standards, will only lead to public confusion and misperception of the rules, and a higher degree of non-compliance. We urge the Park Service to hold all dog walkers to the same standards.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew & JoAnn Zlatunich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Other Comments:

Correspondence Id: 95 **Comment Id:** 339928 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Having experienced multiple encounters with so-called "professional dog walkers" and their packs of dogs, usually off leash and often not interested in obeying voice commands, count me among those who welcome the prospect of some regulation of these inconsiderate people.

Organization:

Commenter: John W Prince **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 24 **Comment Id:** 343269 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I do support the limit of dogs off leash to maximum of 3 dogs (commercial or personal). I hope that dog owners will be better able to control their dogs with a limit on the number. I do believe there should be heavy fines for exceeding this number for any reason. I also support the requirement of dogs to have the dog owner's name and number on the dog in any off leash area. I feel that this will help avoid conflicts between dogs owners and other park visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 155 **Comment Id:** 349885 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support your attempt to regulate dog walkers and think that 4 and no more than 6 dogs is reasonable. ANd they should not drag their leashes. This is why the park is getting degraded, not by me and the other individual citizens who walk dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: cheryl e traverse **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 164 **Comment Id:** 349915 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please do not allow professional dog walkers at Fort Funston. Most are not able to supervise their charges, very difficult to watch them all. Most are off leash and do not respond to voice commands.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 191 **Comment Id:** 350073 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I ALSO BELIEVE THAT IF YOU ELIMINATED " PROFESSIONAL DOG WALKING SERVICES " THE IMPACT WOULD LESSEN BY 50%. TICALLY. IMMEDIATEY!! THESE BUSINESS ACTUALLY MAKE MONEY OFF OF THIS PROPERTY, WE, THE TAXPAYERS PAY FOR IT.

Organization:
Commenter: michael h THALER **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 213 **Comment Id:** 350124 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I DO agree with your recommendations for limiting the number of dogs per person. Please also include that they must not drag leashes.
Organization:
Commenter: cheryl e traverse **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 262 **Comment Id:** 350379 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: THIS SHOULD NOT BE AN AREA USED BY PROFESSIONAL DOG WALKERS
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 270 **Comment Id:** 350396 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am also not in favor of off-leash dog walking anywhere in the GGNRA for professional dog walkers with the current limit of 8 dogs; I strongly believe that no one can control that many dogs at a time. And I don't think dog owners, walking their own 1 or 2 pets, should be penalized for the excessive use of GGNRA spaces by professional dog walkers.
Organization:
Commenter: Ricki-Ellen Brooke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 353 **Comment Id:** 350701 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am also fully supportive of limiting the number of dogs being walked, three should be plenty, as more than that do have a much larger impact on both the environment as well as other visitors.
Organization:
Commenter: Chris Holland **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 360 **Comment Id:** 351151 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Im absolutely in favor of restricting professional dog walkers; as I feel that they are not indicative of the bulk of responsible owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Glenn Hout **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 374 **Comment Id:** 351282 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: My income & livelihood counts on unfettered access to GGNRA lands, and restricting this access wil put me out of business!
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 396 **Comment Id:** 351313 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Having a dog and regularly using a dog walker - as numerous friends do as well - these proposed changes will make it basically impossible to 2) it makes it unfeasible for dog walkers to do their job while keeping prices and availability w/in reason
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 407 **Comment Id:** 351327 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: A few points that I would like to draw to your attention: -off leash dog walking areas enable many dog walkers to earn a liveable income
Organization:
Commenter: Shaun Steingold **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 423 **Comment Id:** 351348 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Any way to curb the professional dog walkers that park at the gate on Lattie? not only are they parking illegally but are not using leashes and leaving lots of doggie calling cards behind.
Organization:
Commenter: ROBERT L FREITAS **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 443 **Comment Id:** 351378 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I vote for limiting the number of dogs a dogwalker can walk.
Organization:
Commenter: Gail Gordon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1016 **Comment Id:** 351437 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a day-to-day observer, I can say that the biggest impact on the park is by those profession dog-walkers whose packs are way too large. Focus on reducing that wear and tear and let's see what evolves

Organization:

Commenter: Lauris C Jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1036 **Comment Id:** 351464 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This will also hurt DOG Walkers business ALOT. DOG WALKERS are an IMPORTANT PART OF PEOPLES LIVES.

Organization:

Commenter: catherine bow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1049 **Comment Id:** 351487 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog walkers, however, I feel should not be allowed to use GGNRA for their private enterprises. I feel it is unsafe for the general public and overall not great for the park's natural environment. I do not think dog walkers can control their packs at all times nor do I feel that their responsibility to their job/employment should rest within the park's borders. I would feel comfortable with dog owners or walkers using the park for dogs, no more than 2 at a time. I would be ok with a dog owner or walker having three dogs at one time in the park as long as they were leashed. I believe one or two dogs can be controlled and more than that, not so much.

Organization:

Commenter: S Polk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 472 **Comment Id:** 351754 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a responsible professional dog walker who regularly takes out small groups (no more than 6/@ one time) my business depends on there being safe places to walk dogs on and off leash.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 500 **Comment Id:** 351815 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: By changing the use of Crissy Field East Beach, Ocean Beach or Fort Funston would be hurting many businesses, dog owning residents and the dog population.

Organization:

Commenter: Patrice A Catanio **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 511 **Comment Id:** 351840 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: No more than 3 dogs per walker
Organization:
Commenter: Dorothy E Gabei **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1171 **Comment Id:** 351886 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Now unlicensed dog walkers use publicly owned and maintained space to make a living without paying for the privilege of dumping tons of urine on Chrissy Field. It I put up a card table and tried to sell sodas without a license I would be ticketed and chased away, because someone else has the refreshment concession, yet tons of urine and feces can be dumped in a park, tree of charge.
Organization:
Commenter: Douglas Holsclaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1214 **Comment Id:** 352004 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you feel the need to restrict dog walking please do not place restrictions on non-professional dog walking. Any restrictions to dog walking should be to dog walking professionals. Something along the lines of what the city of San Francisco is doing in their recent requirements that professional dog walkers need to be licensed and cannot walk more than 6 dogs at a time.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1235 **Comment Id:** 352043 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If this is about professional dog walkers, put in place measures that restrict/control large groups; do not penalize individuals.
Organization:
Commenter: Joan Lynch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1358 **Comment Id:** 352393 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Further, many people employ dog walking services - - banning dogs off-leash would destroy jobs.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael L Myers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1367 **Comment Id:** 352402 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The only suggestion for any kind of change, would be limiting a number of dogs under escort of the professional "Dog Walker". Sometimes when is more that 5 dogs per person the control can be lost.

Organization:

Commenter: Marek Krukowski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1399 **Comment Id:** 352442 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you restrict the access to off leash areas, this will push dog walkers to go to local parks which will be a burden for the city. It also might put many dog walkers out of business.

Organization: Joan 4 Pets

Commenter: Joan L Mapou **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 600 **Comment Id:** 352695 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: PLEASE do not allow professional dog walkers into any GGNRA areas. in the past six months I have been bitten by an OFF LEASH dog being walked by a completely inattentive dog walker, at least 12 OFF LEASH dogs, none of which responded to any voice control. the dog who bit me, hole in the jeans and 6 puncture wounds, a truly vicious dog. and also in the past six months, i was knocked to the ground, on the beach, by several OFF LEASH large dogs, running out of any control, a pack of at least 10, dog walker had no voice control whatsoever. seniors are especially vulnerable to these irresponsible dog walkers!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 606 **Comment Id:** 352711 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: 5) I would imagine that the problem is not dogs per se but the number of dogs. Being a dog person myself I am often bothered by the number of dogs that dog walkers are walking on Alta. I would suggest limiting the number of dogs that are allowed to 3-4.

Organization:

Commenter: Hansi Hagemeister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 609 **Comment Id:** 352718 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are still significant ways in which the new rules fall short of protecting wildlife: ï¿½ They do not require fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas. ï¿½ They allow commercial dog walking with permits, for up to six dogs.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 614 **Comment Id:** 352732 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: However, there are still significant ways in which the new rules fall short of protecting wildlife: * They do not require fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas. * They allow commercial dog walking with permits, for up to six dogs. * They dont set numerical compliance goals. The first draft of the EIS required a fixed percentage (such as 75%) owners to comply with the rules, or tougher regulatory measures would automatically kick in. We are concerned that without fixed compliance targets, the new rules will not be enforced.
Organization:
Commenter: Juliet A Lamont **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 615 **Comment Id:** 352737 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Professional dog-walking is definitely not to be supported by GGNRA. These are for profit businesses supported by public funds. They in no way enhance the various missions of the parks.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 624 **Comment Id:** 352760 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There should be a limit on the number of dogs that a person can walk . Three should be the maximum.
Organization: California Native Plant Society
Commenter: Jean Conner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1459 **Comment Id:** 352813 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are COUNTLESS small businesses that support dog owners... walkers... groomers... boarders... and they ALL will lose business if this gets passes
Organization:
Commenter: Harrison Westwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 649 **Comment Id:** 352818 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As a dog owner and resident of San Francisco, the banning of off leash dogs in the GGNRA concerns me. Perhaps we can put more restrictions on commercial "dog walkers" to

limit the number of dogs per walker to ensure they are able to properly look out for their charges. It is really those who are not keeping control of their dogs which have the potential to cause damage or annoyance to tourists and the like.

Organization:

Commenter: Erica C Ortega **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 732 **Comment Id:** 353066 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: A more considerate approach would be to limit commercial dog walking as proposed, but keep the area of access open as it currently is, and more strictly enforce these commercial limitations. These areas are for public enjoyment, not commercial for-profit use. The biggest problem with the status quo is that large numbers of dogs loosely under control by commercial dog walkers is compromising safety and enjoyment of these lands for other city residents. I urge you to consider stricter commercial dog walking regulations, but at the same time leaving wide area access as it exists today for the residents of San Francisco to enjoy with their own dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Marion Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 735 **Comment Id:** 353069 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I agree mostly with Alternative F except that I would like to see a smaller number of areas available for commercial off-leash dog walking. Commercial dog walkers generally have transport available to them (as they pick up dogs from residences) so they are able to get to the areas open to them.

Organization:

Commenter: Ciaran Wills **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 767 **Comment Id:** 353179 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I do however support limits to how many dogs commercial dog walkers may control at any one time.

Organization:

Commenter: Kyle McCann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1646 **Comment Id:** 353247 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our family applauds your efforts to implement a balanced and comprehensive dog management plan in the GGNRA and we support the NPS's preferred alternative. We have seen and experienced too many situations where careless owners allowed their off-leash dogs to knock over children, attack wildlife, invade protected areas and leave feces on public paths. This

has been particularly pronounced when professional dogwalkers have been unable to provide sufficient attention to all of the animals under their care. We support the new measures to allow all visitors to enjoy and experience the GGNRA and preserve the environment for future generations.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 794 **Comment Id:** 353301 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Commercial dog walkers should be required to have their dogs leashed.

Organization:

Commenter: john e hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 798 **Comment Id:** 353307 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I also firmly believe from much experience around professional dog walkers and as a dog owner that 6 dogs in one person's care is too many. This number should be reduced.

Organization:

Commenter: amanda wallace **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 808 **Comment Id:** 353340 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I'm also concerned about the burgeoning number of professional dog walkers. This could make the growing number of dogs untenable.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 812 **Comment Id:** 353348 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I truly think that if you regulate the number of dogs that each dog walker has to 8 dogs like the city has done as well as enforce no more than 10 dogs in one area or dog walkers standing with each other, this will alleviate many problems. When a dog walker has control of 7 dogs and has them with her or him, it really is not a spectacle like when someone has 10 plus dogs or walking with another dog walker.

Organization: Dog Adventures

Commenter: Lisa J Gates **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1667 **Comment Id:** 353511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you need to ask dogwalkers to register and put a cap on the number of dogs

one can take - fine. Cap it at 5 dogs. That allows the walker to make some money. Don't punish all of us because of complaints from a few people.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa Brinkmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 878 **Comment Id:** 353543 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition I do not think that professional dog walkers should be allowed to use GGNR. Our federal lands are not used by other commercial entities.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1716 **Comment Id:** 353684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are part of that community, and these areas represent logical places for dog walking. But the number of off-leash dogs has become unsustainable, and commercial dog walkers are abusing their free access to these areas. The limit of six dogs/person is especially important, as is enforcement of leash laws in sensitive wildlife areas. I believe that voice control of off-leash dogs is rarely happening.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 943 **Comment Id:** 353803 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Additionally, regulate dog-owners and dog-walkers who have more than 4 dogs at a time, so they can easily monitor the dogs they have.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Ganner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1793 **Comment Id:** 353882 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It will also hurt the many dog-walking businesses that rely on off-leash areas, like Fort Funston, which provide a safe environment for dogs to roam free and exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: kathryn m weeks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1795 **Comment Id:** 353927 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It will also hurt the many dog-walking businesses that rely on off-leash areas, like Fort Funston, as they provide a safe, natural environment for dogs to roam and play. This, in

turn, improves the quality of life for SF residents
Organization:
Commenter: kathryn m weeks **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1799 **Comment Id:** 354083 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I think professional dog walkers should have a dog limit per each excursion to keep proper control of their dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Maria Tieu **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1811 **Comment Id:** 354135 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In Sum, the tighter the restrictions on dog walkers, private or commercial, the better. In particular, commercial dog walkers should be heavily restricted - they have 10 dogs at times and let them off leash at times. Sometimes there is more than one commercial dog walker at same location. When requested to control animals, they are rude and claim they are not subject to regulations.
Organization:
Commenter: arnold schuster **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 999 **Comment Id:** 354368 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dog walkers My experience is that "6 dogs under voice control" is almost always an oxymoron, three is sometimes stretching it.
Organization:
Commenter: Linda Cohn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1856 **Comment Id:** 354379 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Professional dog walkers often have as many as 9-10 dogs. The worst offenders are those that do not keep them on leash. But even on leash, no one can effectively manage that many dogs. Professional dog watchers should be limited to a maximum of 4 dogs and only permitted in certain, non sensitive areas. Professional dog walkers should also be charged fees for their use of the park and required to have permits as other vendors in the Park are required.
Organization:
Commenter: Jean Colvin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1888 **Comment Id:** 354457 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Further, I do NOT believe that commercial dog walking should be allowed at the GGNRA. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public. Also, I have personal experience with seeing commercial dog walkers lack full control over their dogs and dog waste, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: Allison R Levin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1906 **Comment Id:** 354520 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Organization:

Commenter: Diane Fenster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1909 **Comment Id:** 354526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Commercial dog walkers usually cannot control the dogs, nor do they even try, even though these people present themselves as professional.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2001 **Comment Id:** 354672 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I understand that commercial dog walking is under review. This does not seem like an appropriate activity for a National Park. It seems that it would allow a small group of individuals to benefit commercially from the park at a cost to all other users.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan R Hubbard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2011 **Comment Id:** 354682 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I believe that a significant portion of the complaints with respect to dog feces not being picked up can be attributed to commercial dog walkers. When they have 8 to 10 dogs to care for, it is impossible for them to keep an eye on all of dogs at all times to know when any of the dogs defecated. I believe individual dog owners are being penalized for the actions of commercial dog walkers.

Organization:

Commenter: Victor Quan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2029 **Comment Id:** 354702 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.
Organization:
Commenter: Joan Downey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2974 **Comment Id:** 355295 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Professional dog walkers use public lands and often let the dogs run free. Sometimes tbey meet up there and you have dozen or more dogs running around taking over tne beach.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Alan Hightman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2102 **Comment Id:** 355694 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I don't think that commercial dog walking should be allowed in the park.
Organization:
Commenter: joe g cernac **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2126 **Comment Id:** 355762 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.
Organization:
Commenter: Denise Louie **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2126 **Comment Id:** 355763 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.
Organization:

Commenter: Denise Louie **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2130 **Comment Id:** 355768 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I feel that no commercial dog walkers should be permitted on GGNRA lands, and if the decision is made to allow them, the number of dogs they supervise should be limited to three.
Organization:
Commenter: Samuel R Gilbert **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2612 **Comment Id:** 356880 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On a Monday morning, we saw several dog walks . . . with 8 to 10 dogs and all their 'doggy gear'. What a wonderful service to residents of SF!
Organization:
Commenter: Renee Crevelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2621 **Comment Id:** 356915 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Moreover, Fort Funston was littered with dog feces and dog walkers who could not "voice control" the 10-15 dogs they would walk at one time. This is a safety hazard for anyone who is trying to enjoy a park and doesn't want to play with dogs and/or has an allergy or intense fear of them.
Organization:
Commenter: Thea Zajac **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2759 **Comment Id:** 357199 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Policy Must Address For-Profit Dog-Walkers.A visit to Crissy Field on a weekday in the late morning reveals that the beach is being used by numerous for-profit dog walkers, who are conducting their private business using public space. On a recent Friday at 11am there were about 80 dogs on the beach under the oversight of about 10 walkers. Most walkers appear to have 6-10 dogs under their supervision, with the result that their dogs are very poorly controlled.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2785 **Comment Id:** 357457 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also commercial dog walking is not an appropriate active in a National Park.

Organization:
Commenter: Lynn Strandberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357472 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If it were not for my dog, I would not get out and get this exercise nor would my dog. These are the only places in the Bay Area where we can run, play ball, splash in the ocean. The NPS changes will seriously impact the physical and mental health of countless people and their pets as well as the livelihoods of those who make their livings working with dogs outdoors.
Organization: Dog City Tours
Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2806 **Comment Id:** 357525 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I do like the 3 dog limit for commercial dog walkers.
Organization:
Commenter: Nancy Mullane **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2828 **Comment Id:** 357584 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a dog owner who also works and must use a dog walker from time to time, it is also important that dog walkers have places available to walk their dogs, and be able to walk enough dogs to make a living so they can continue to provide this essential service.
Organization: Neto Community Network
Commenter: Molly Clark **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2845 **Comment Id:** 357610 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I agree that professional dogwalkers have often abused the privilege of using parks and beaches, but I think families and individuals with one or two dogs should be able to run them off-leash in most of these areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan J Anthony **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3027 **Comment Id:** 357719 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dog walkers especially on Alta trail will usually have 7 dogs each, all of leash. There will usually be 5 different groups of dog walkers creating an absolute nightmare scenario. It is impossible to enjoy the trail when out of control dogs are everywhere. I should not

have my enjoyment of these trails dismissed because the "dog walkers" have taken over this space. These people are earning a living doing this, not someone who's taking the family dog out for a walk. I'm a dog owner and appreciate being able to take my dog to some of these places, but I'm sick and tired of having my experience ruined by a business using a public resource for their personal gain. I think anyone with more than 3 dogs should be held to a different standard and not allowed to use the public resources like this

Organization:

Commenter: Serena Dugan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3057 **Comment Id:** 357830 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs have taken over baker beach. Dog walkers bring 5 to 10 dogs at a time.leaving feces. Dogs are out of control and barking.

Organization:

Commenter: Reid Russell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3099 **Comment Id:** 357901 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To restrict dog walking i.e off leash, in such a broad stroke, will only cause more crowding and have a negative effect on the livelihood of commercial dog walkers. Personally, I feel the amount of dogs a dog walker is allowed at one time, should be reduced to no more than 4. I typically do no more than three.

Organization:

Commenter: ellen Garvie **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3110 **Comment Id:** 357915 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This is a travesty. Our dogs deserve better. We deserve better than this. Professional dog walkers have been forced to spend thousands taking courses, extra equipment, getting their cars and businesses up to code. We have gotten licensed, permitted, bonded and insured, we pay business taxes, and been following all the stipulations put upon us, yet this is how we are treated???

Organization:

Commenter: ida joseph **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3204 **Comment Id:** 357969 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: That being said we have had many incidents with commercial dog walkers. These walkers on a daily basis have 15-22 dogs per person and most times running wild as they please and uncontrollable when an incident arises. My dogs have been injured 3 times in the last few months due to this scenario.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3371 **Comment Id:** 358259 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Professional dog-walkers should not be allowed to use a tax-supported park for their businesses.
Organization:
Commenter: Daniel J Richman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3374 **Comment Id:** 358274 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also, the dog walkers walk a dozen dogs at once, to rack up fees, and they probably oppose leashes because they want to make the maximum profit by having multiple dogs with them each walk.
Organization:
Commenter: Mary D Lucid **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2380 **Comment Id:** 358465 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The hired dog walkers are the absolute worst. Please fine these people. What other business owner can take advantage of public lands without regard or recompense for the damage they do?
Organization:
Commenter: Patty Compas **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2385 **Comment Id:** 358864 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users. It is a practice which should be prohibited since it will adversely impact park resources and values.
Organization:
Commenter: Patrick Skain **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2413 **Comment Id:** 358913 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There are hundreds of dog walking companies that use the current open GGNRA lands with good relations. To put us on city streets and private lands would not be a

great option for pet care firms. Many dog walkers are one client away from being homeless and several are over 55 years of age with little hope of landing a new job , only to depend on our Government for medical and food financial help. Bringing California further in debt.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian B Bullard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3777 **Comment Id:** 359514 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog walkers I have hired NEED these areas and others (Chrissy Field, etc...) to walk the dogs that 40% of San Franciscans have!!! I am dismayed at the proposed leash-only areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Beth Allen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3784 **Comment Id:** 359727 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However, I don't feel that it is appropriate to allow commercial dog walking on National Park Lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean Conner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4015 **Comment Id:** 359831 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This plan is a terrible idea for all residents, not only dog owners. I run on these trails nearly daily, and all - and I do mean all - canines I encounter are well-behaved, orderly and non-destructive. I've yet to see an example of an out of control dog wreaking havoc on either me or the surroundings. Professional dog walkers rely on these trails and paths for their livelihoods, while owners deserve a nice environment in which to exercise their animals. i urge you to reconsider this ill-advised plan and allow the county to set the standards for pet owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Jon Pankin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3792 **Comment Id:** 359848 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA should be a protected natural resource and not utilized for commercial dog walking activities which disturb the sensitive flora and fauna

Organization:

Commenter: Philipp Borchard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4021 **Comment Id:** 359882 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Visitors to the park should be limited to a maximum of two dogs per person. The park should not serve commercial dog-walkers, who are a disturbance to those trying to enjoy nature in the parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert A Lewis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4037 **Comment Id:** 360290 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. - Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Organization: VoCal, SaveMclarenpark.org

Commenter: karen m arnold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4037 **Comment Id:** 360293 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please help to regulate this fast growing industry. As a resident of San Francisco, I'ts not fair that we can't enjoy the parks with this many dogs running around unsupervised. I want to be able to enjoy myself when I go out in nature and not have so many dogs at once. There are too many dogs per person and they are off the leash. There are a lot of people who don't have dogs and they deserve to enjoy the park too. The wild animals in the Natl. Rec area are getting a raw deal too. I was upset to see the photo of an unrestrained dog aggressively pursuing a great grey heron. This is unacceptable! The Dog Management Plan is exactly what we need.

Organization: VoCal, SaveMclarenpark.org

Commenter: karen m arnold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4039 **Comment Id:** 360311 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In 2013 I started my professional dog walking business, and I've invested over $20,000 in order to get properly educated & equipped. If this plan passes, there is no way I can afford to continue my business as the only remaining park space in the region will be overflowed with other walkers to the point that it is unsafe for the dogs I service and the environment. I have not had enough time to make this business profitable enough to make back any money on that investment, and therefore this plan will literally cost me $20,000 should it pass.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrew Keller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4048 **Comment Id:** 360333 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: We support limiting the number of dogs that can be walked per person to 3.
Organization:
Commenter: JOHN EAGER **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3992 **Comment Id:** 360370 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also, it is usually the dog walkers who are the most rude and disrespectful of the idea of sharing the area. Many have little control over the large number of dogs that they walk, and they really don't care if the children are uneasy or scared. They are at Fort Funston to do a job and have no respect for the children or the Environmental Science Center program. And many don't even pick up after the dogs, or leave the plastic bags full of feces on the trails- -so rude and unsanitary!
Organization:
Commenter: Andrea A Gormley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4562 **Comment Id:** 360654 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The impact of your plan on my industry will be huge. Many people will no longer have work. Businesses will fold, debts will go unpaid. people who contribute to society now will find themselves unable to do so anymore.
Organization:
Commenter: steve r hooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4102 **Comment Id:** 361284 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please reconsider the severe reduction in off leash dog rules for GGNRA. The beach at Fort Funston, for example, is so valuable for the exercise of our pets. Should the real issue be the use of GGNRA by dog walkers with numerous animals not properly controlled, please institute restrictions targeted to multi-dog walkers who do not regulate their animals.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4713 **Comment Id:** 361373 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please designate as much space as possible to the responsible use by people alone. Remove dogs from sensitive areas. Reduce the number of dogs (there is no reason for us, the tax payer, to provide spaces for commercial enterprises like dog-walking services), and enforce these laws. Limit the places for pets to those places that pose no threat to our native plants and animals, and especially to the threatened and sensitive species that call GGNRA their

home.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Alan Harper **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4784 **Comment Id:** 361520 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I support the GGNRA's dog management plan. Dog walkers should not be earning income from the use of our parks, but this plan at least addresses the reality of our urban/parks congestion. Six dogs on a single width trail is disruptive to visitors and to tour programs. A limit of 3 dogs is preferred.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara Corff **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4896 **Comment Id:** 361715 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Finally, while I work full time, I also hire the services of local professional dog walkers. Having ocean beach as an alternative for them is also very important to me, and the service they perform is very important
Organization:
Commenter: patrick callahan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4932 **Comment Id:** 361792 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan must not allow commercial dog walking, which is not an appropriate activity for national park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking provides no service or benefit to other park users, adversely impacts park resources and values, and only serves private enterprise at the expense of the American public.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard Bradus **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4956 **Comment Id:** 361833 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In the last 2 years the Alta trail towards the trail head at the end of Donahue Street in Marin City/ Sausalito has been overran by professional dog handlers who come here daily by the dozens, bringing hundreds of dogs per day. Even though the majority of them is quite courteous regarding pet waste (There is a pet waste bin and bag dispenser at the trailhead) there are so many dogs on this trail every day that lots of dog piles remain in the open, making this trail especially on warm days a disgusting experience.
Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 5089 **Comment Id:** 362168 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Of all the sites considered in the in-depth document, Fort Funston is the one that concerns me most. It is a joy to walk along the water with my small dog, who leaps and runs along the surf with great enthusiasm. I would hope that maximum (responsible) beach accessibility continue to be allowed for persons with 3 or fewer dogs. It is hard to imagine how walkers with 6 dogs could adequately monitor dog behavior in a way that respects the environment and other users.

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne Markel-Fox **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5151 **Comment Id:** 362280 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Commercial dog walking is an inappropriate activity for National Park lands. Commercial dog walking has never been legally permitted on any of our National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of parklands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will not provide any service or benefit to park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public. The GGNRA is probably the least desirable Park in the National system in which to allow commercial dog walking, heavily used as it is, in a densely populated urban setting where open space is at a premium. Permitting commercial dog walking contravenes the NPS Criteria for appropriate park use: it fails to provide for visitor safety, disrupts the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, subtracts from public understanding and enjoyment of the park, and undermines a sense of ownership and stewardship for the park

Organization: International Urban Estuary Network/Save the Bay

Commenter: Arlene Gemmill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5200 **Comment Id:** 362589 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Commercial dog walking is NOT an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking would provide no service or benefit to any park users, would adversely impact park resources and values, and would serve private profit at the expense of the public resources.

Organization:

Commenter: Trent W Orr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5340 **Comment Id:** 362989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If this plan goes forward witout any apparent accomodation of dog owners it

will A) negatively impact the liveliehood of professional dog owners
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4300 **Comment Id:** 363079 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I was involved with the licensing of Commercial Dog Walkers in City Parks. They do not need a license to walk/run their dogs in the GGNRA. Some may use the GGNRA to avoid being licensed. They provide no benefit nor service to other park users and should not be allowed to use Federal property for private financial gain.
Organization:
Commenter: Philip Gerrie **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363165 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Professional Dog Walkers place a tremendous burden on the natural resources of the parks and GGNRA Staff.
Organization:
Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363173 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Professional Dog Walking should not be allowed but being that the burden of proof is so high for the officers, all dog walkers should be limited to three dogs per walker.
Organization:
Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5415 **Comment Id:** 363186 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Visitors to the park should be limited to a maximum of two dogs per person. I live at the trailhead of a large open space, and I see that people with more than two dogs are often not in control of all of their dogs; they do not notice when their dogs defecate and they do not keep them under control. There must be limits to the numbers of dogs that people can bring, and this number allowed must be justified with real information about how average users handle their dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: JOHN P Dumbacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5416 **Comment Id:** 363190 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Any visitor should be limited to no more than two dogs.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Michael Lozeau **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4340 **Comment Id:** 363789 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I urge the NPS to regulate dog walking in the GGNRA and agree with the "Preferred Alternative F Plan" concerning Fort Funston (FOFU). The most important issue is the reduction of the number of dogs a person is allowed to walk. Walking through FOFU is like walking through herds of sheep running out of control causing degradation of plant and animal life.
Organization: Fort Funston Nursery Volunteer
Commenter: Ingrid E Cabada **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5659 **Comment Id:** 364084 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Furthermore, it will severely restrict our dog walker, who takes our dog to Fort Funston daily. Without this opportunity, our dog would be confined in doors during the week.
Organization:
Commenter: elizabeth cavagnaro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5678 **Comment Id:** 364117 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I strongly support the Draft Dog Management Plan. It is crucial to have some trails available with no dogs on those trails. At present it is very difficult to find a trail where there are not dogwalkers. Trails should be very well marked and fenced if needed. Visitors should be limited to only two dogs in the park. It is crucial that new dog regulations be enforced.
Organization:
Commenter: David E Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5798 **Comment Id:** 364323 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Visitors to the park should be limited to a maximum of two dogs per person
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Diane Ross-leech **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5810 **Comment Id:** 364351 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: limit dog walkers in the park to 3 dogs and to not permit commercial dog walking

Organization:
Commenter: Lew Stringer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5941 **Comment Id:** 364764 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If there are too many dogs at once then reduce the number of dogs one person can bring. The professional dog walkers are allowing many families/individuals to have dogs even though they are not home to be with them. Make it very expensive for the dog walkers to operate their businesses, at the moment they operate for free. It will reduce the number of professional dog walkers and dog owners and therefore dogs!
Organization:
Commenter: Vivien MacDonald **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5972 **Comment Id:** 364852 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Eight dogs is a pretty high limit and wouldn't significantly impact the current level of use in dog walking areas - maybe that limit should be lowered or commercial dog walkers should be charged a fee or banned.
Organization:
Commenter: Finn Black **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6002 **Comment Id:** 364876 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Commercial dog walkers have no place in the National Park areas. They typically have 6 or more dogs, which they cannot pick up after effectively. I have seen several instances where they don't even control their charges effectively. Their favored areas have become a tread at your own risk area.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia J Greene **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6012 **Comment Id:** 364955 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SFT Board has voted to support a limit on the number of dogs that are brought to the park by recreational dog walkers. Our Board believes that three dogs per dog-walker should be the maximum number to strive for in the future but we recognize the difficulty of bringing any changes to the Plan at this time; we would therefore support the limitation of six dogs per person for the time being. But the question of whether the Park should allow commercial dog walking in any form will remain.
Organization: San Francisco Tomorrow
Commenter: Mary Anne Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6025 **Comment Id:** 364978 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Chrissey Field has more dog walkers now. Most have a.minimum of six dogs. They arrive around nine thirty. I believe very few people can control six to ten dogs off leash. Many of the dog walkers visit in the East Beach area and are not watching their dogs closely.. I believe that there should be a two dog limit at the East Beach so that residents can bring their children and dog. Dog walkers should have to park by the warming hut since there are fewer people and children in that area.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy N Zacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4436 **Comment Id:** 365263 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Lastly, I do not support the use of the park for money making private enterprises such as Commercial Dog Walkers. - Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. - Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Organization:

Commenter: Jan Blum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4467 **Comment Id:** 365353 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Furthermore it seems to me that commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public. The DAILY visits of troops of 6 or 8 dogs running together as a pack - often unleashed - multiplies the impact on wildlife and recreational visitors alike.

Organization:

Commenter: Harvey A Ridley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6146 **Comment Id:** 365618 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston has been inundated with professional dog walkers coming day after day, mornings and afternoons. To have them limited to 6 dogs per person would be great. Keeping track of 10 or 12 unleashed dogs, especially while simultaneously talking on a cell phone is just not possible. If this goes through, please require them to throw away their bagged dog feces in trash cans and not leave them at the top of stairway/sand ladders (because who wants to carry bags of poop down and back up again?) for later (maybe) pick up.

Organization:
Commenter: Sharon Kato **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6708 **Comment Id:** 365774 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: CONTROL THE # OF DOGS THAT DOG WALKERS CAN HAVE
Organization:
Commenter: Paul R Broder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6705 **Comment Id:** 365776 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: PLEASE LIMIT PRO. DOG WALKERS TO 4 DOGS AT ONE TIME ENFORCE IT!
Organization:
Commenter: Rebecca Broder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6705 **Comment Id:** 365777 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: THE "PROFESSIONAL" DOG WALKERS ARE THE REAL PROBLEM.
Organization:
Commenter: Rebecca Broder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6353 **Comment Id:** 365787 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: PERMITS FOR COMMERCIAL DOG WALKERS Why should the GGNRA value the livelihood of commercial dog walking businesses over the public visitor's experience at any of the parks? How would permits be monitored or enforced? at what cost?
Organization:
Commenter: withheld for privacy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6353 **Comment Id:** 365788 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I recently saw a couple with 22 out of control dogs between them completely monopolizing a large area at Ft Funston. They made no pretense of caring what kind of experience anyone other than themselves and their dogs could have with them there. Please don't allow commercial interests to dictate the parameters of public access to public land. Please take Ft Funston back from dog walking businesses and return that irreplaceably beautiful spot to human visitors to enjoy.
Organization:
Commenter: withheld for privacy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6204 **Comment Id:** 366003 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not think that commercial dog walking belongs in a national park. It is a business, not a recreation. It may be very pleasant to get to conduct one's business in a beautiful national park, but that is not fair to the rest of us who want to enjoy being outdoors and are tired of the vast number of dogs. There are 32 dedicated off leash dog parks in San Francisco already and more on the way. Millions of dollars have been spent on SF dogs, yet they now prefer our national park.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6204 **Comment Id:** 366004 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I think that the maximum number of dogs that a private person should walk is two.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366085 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: CDW will have unacceptable impacts on the park including: - Large groups of dogs and commercial dog walking vehicles will create an aesthetic in the park similar to that of a dog park-including related visuals, sounds, and odors. - NPS personnel will have to dedicate more time to regulating CDW, increasing the economic impact that CDW will have on park resources without recouping costs from the businesses-the dog walkers-profiting from exploiting park resources. - CDWs will typically bring in many more dogs than private dog owners and walkers, resulting in increased displacement of dog owners and other park users. Notably, the SEIS fails to address any such impacts.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366086 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: CDW does not qualify for Commercial Use Authorization. CDW does not provide services to visitors and CDW activity would be more than incidental use of the park. (See Management Policies 2006 Sec. 10.3) CDW does not qualify for Special Use Permit. The SEIS fails to demonstrate CDW's qualification for Special Use Permit (See Directors Order #53). A. The SEIS fails to demonstrate that CDW will in no way harm the integrity of park resources or values, including the opportunities that otherwise would be present for the enjoyment of those resources or values (See DO#53 Sec. 3) (See Management Policies 2006 Sec. 1.4.4-1.4.5). B. The SEIS fails to cite an existing legal right or statutory authority for CDW use of the park (See

DO#53 sec. 3) (See Management Policies 2006 Sec. 1.4.4-1.4.5). C. The SEIS fails to demonstrate that CDW will not trigger any of the following criteria: (See DO#53 Sec. 4) - will create an unacceptable impact on park resources or values, or - is contrary to the purposes for which the park was established, or - will unreasonably disrupt the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, or - will unreasonably interfere with visitor activities or NPS administrative activities, or - create an unsafe or unhealthy environment for other visitors or employees, or - result in conflict with other existing uses. In fact, as discussed above, CDW will (1) impact park resources, (2) disrupt the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, (3) interfere with visitor activities or NPS administration of those activities, (4) create unsafe or unhealthy environments for visitors or employees, and (5) conflict with other existing uses. At a minimum, the SEIS must be revised to address these points and explain why CDW is permittable.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366088 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: CDW can be accommodated elsewhere in the local area. The SEIS does demonstrate the imperative to permit CDW on national park land. Commercial dog walkers have access to at least 28 off-leash dog play areas throughout the City of San Francisco and make frequent-and unrestrained-use of San Francisco's remaining city parks. (See, e.g., SEIS at 31).

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6287 **Comment Id:** 366432 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Existing regulations pertaining to commercial dog walkers and existing protections directed at other areas should be enforced

Organization:

Commenter: Seth Feigenbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366920 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If pets are permitted within GGNRA, park visitors should be limited to two dogs per visitor. On trails, visitors with more than two dogs have a wider space requirement and have the potential to impact other park visitors by disrupting or impeding their progress along the trail. In off-leash areas, few dog owners or walkers are capable of exerting voice control over one or two dogs, let alone more than two at the same time.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6614 **Comment Id:** 367198 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I think commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial doq walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Ream **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6435 **Comment Id:** 367490 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Additionally, as a business owner focused on dogs and a San Francisco resident is does not make sense that the GGNRA and the City of San Francisco have 2 different numbers of dogs that can be walked LEGALLY off leash. Right now the GGNRA is swamped with commercial dog walkers who are abusing the infinite number of dogs that they can walk. When the ruling changes to 6 at the GGNRA those walkers will infiltrate the city parks and bombard the surrounding communities: parking, barking, erosion, other public park users, etc. It only makes sense if the reciprocity in numbers was consistent.

Organization:

Commenter: Natalie Tondelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368117 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Do not make the same mistake as the SF Rec. & Park Dept. has made by fearing the misperception of dog owner political power and not enforce dog use. As it is now, RPD staff (gardeners, managers, recreation directors) is instructed to not confront dog owners when they violate Park Codes, yet welcome private residents to "self-police" and take the brunt of dog owner rage at being told they must stop bad behavior in local parks and playgrounds. The number of Park Ranger officers is very low and enforcing dog rules has deliberately been virtually ignored. Commercial dog walkers should prove easily visible training, licensing, and with proper personally supplied cleaning materials versus taxes paid for and supplied.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6648 **Comment Id:** 368221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However, I'm especially concerned about commercial dog walkers using the GGNRA for their commercial business. This activity is clearly not appropriate in any National Park. Use of the GGNRA for this purpose exploits park lans strictly for private financial profit.Commercial dog walking provides absolutely no service or benefit to any park user. To the contrary, it will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expence of the american public.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim Morrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 130 **Comment Id:** 368312 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: And just forget about professional baby strollers - there's just no room for commercial activity in the GGNRA. Unless we're talking about cafes, restaurants, museums, office complexes, yacht races, blue angels, road construction, fitness centers, or bowling lanes.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368411 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Therefore, it is likely that a highly disproportionate number of serious incidents are associated with visitors with three or more dogs. Even the proposed limit of three offleash dogs may not limit the risk associated with visitors having more than one dog off leash. Such a result suggests that GGNRA should take a careful look at the risks of allowing multiple dogs off leash, and suggests that any area of the Park where this occurs may not be appropriate for vulnerable visitor groups, such as children.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 4256 **Comment Id:** 368464 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS fails to demonstrate that commercial dog walking meets the NPS criteria for Special Use Permitting as set forth in the Organic Act, the GGNRA enabling legislation, and NPS Director's Order #53. The SEIS fails to enumerate or to apply these criteria to an evaluation of the appropriateness of commercial dog walking in the GGNRA, and fails to express sufficient conclusions that justify the inclusion of commercial dog walking as a component of the Preferred Alternative. As a decision document, the SEIS fails to articulate a rational connection between the presented material and the final decision. As such, we urge the Park Service to eliminate the commercial dog walking component from the Preferred Alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew & JoAnn Zlatunich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6459 **Comment Id:** 368530 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Commercial dog walking has been a source of some of the worst resource-damaging abuses of off-leash activity. We strongly encourage that it be banned within the GGNRA. There should be steep fines for violations above those which are levied on dog owners for violations. If commercial dog-walking is allowed, which we oppose, it must be strictly regulated and fair fees must be required. Furthermore, commercial dog walking is contrary to the purpose for which the park was established, may create impacts on park resources and values,

may disrupt the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, may create an unsafe environment for other visitors, and may result in conflict with other existing uses.

Organization: San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Commenter: Steven Krefting **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6551 **Comment Id:** 368602 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please help to regulate this fast growing industry. As a resident of San Francisco, I am concerned about the aggressive nature of commercial dogwalkers and their sense of entitlement over resources which should be shared and enjoyed by everyone. People who go to enjoy the wonderful natural areas which are the gems of our modern society don't necessarily want to be bombarded by a gaggle of dogs. Often, these groups are led by a single person, who is motivated by profit and not the safety and comfort of those around them. I urge you to regulate this and I applaud you for considering this measure.

Organization:

Commenter: Sharon Arnold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6552 **Comment Id:** 368604 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please help to regulate this fast growing industry. As a resident of San Francisco, I am concerned about the aggressive nature of commercial dogwalkers and their sense of entitlement over resources which should be shared and enjoyed by everyone. People who go to enjoy the wonderful natural areas which are the gems of our modern society don't necessarily want to be bombarded by a gaggle of dogs. Often, these groups are led by a single person, who is motivated by profit and not the safety and comfort of those around them. I urge you to regulate this and I applaud you for considering this measure.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Arnold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6553 **Comment Id:** 368606 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please help to regulate this fast growing industry. As a resident of San Francisco, I'ts not fair that we can't enjoy the parks with this many dogs running around unsupervised. I want to be able to enjoy myself when I go out in nature and not have so many dogs at once. There are too many dogs per person and they are off the leash. There are a lot of people who don't have dogs and they deserve to enjoy the park too

Organization:

Commenter: Ian Arnold-Eitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6665 **Comment Id:** 369533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I understand there is discussion about commercial dog walkers, and their use of the lands. Limiting the access to just seven spots in Marin will make these seven areas much more congested, and any issues that people are noting now will intensify. I agree with the suggestions that commercial dog walkers should be limited to the number of dogs to walker' whether the number is 3 to one, six to one, or something else, I can't speak to. I would suggest GGNRA look to what other states are doing with regard to this and what works. I do suggest that since these commercial endeavors are being operated on public lands, there should be a permitting fee like any other commercial business that conducts business on public land for private gain.

Organization:

Commenter: Scott Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/09/2014)

WH2010 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Affected Environment (Substantive)

1. **Commenters recounted experiences of dogs harassing, disturbing, or killing wildlife. Actions include chasing shorebirds, digging in wildlife holes, and flushing upland species. Some commenters were concerned that wildlife did not have another place to go.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 163 **Comment Id:** 349914 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am concerned about the damage dogs do to wildlife and wildlife habits in the GGNRA. I witness many dog owners allowing their pets to run even in restricted snowy plover nesting areas. I am a dog lover and in fact have volunteered and donated to dog rescue and welfare charities for years, but wildlife matters, too.

Organization: Mrs.

Commenter: Adriana Pagano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2291 **Comment Id:** 357636 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I live between Sweeney Ridge and Milagra Ridge in Pacifica and hike there often. I have had dogs run at me and have seen large dogs chase coyote, deer and rabbits. Wildlife cannot be protected without some restrictions on dogs. Unleashed dogs invite conflicts with people and coyotes. I also volunteer in a Wildlife Rehab program and see the effects on birds, skunks, opossums injured because of contact with dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Sharon J Hagen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3280 **Comment Id:** 358039 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have observed dogs in "leashed" protective sanctuary areas chasing deer, owls, birds and other wildlife, sometimes, to the owner's dismay, actually catching this wildlife in their jaws. After the wildlife has been harmed by the unleashed dog, the owner may put their dog temporarily on leash but there is not a mutual respect for the hiking trails, hillsides or wildlife there. Many dog owners here are actually offended when a person asks them to put their dog on leash in a leash only area

Organization:

Commenter: Sandy g Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3397 **Comment Id:** 358319 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am also an avid birder. I visited the Sutro Baths last year when the vagrant river otter was there. I was shocked when I saw some visitors let their dog tromp along the waters edge, following the movements of the otter without regard to causing stress upon the terrain or the animal.

Organization:

Commenter: Elaine K Geffen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3519 **Comment Id:** 359160 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have watched my own dog chase birds along the shoreline while I ran after it, calling to no effect. I have watched other dog owners let their dogs chase birds without making any effort at all to stop them.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda L Agerter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4808 **Comment Id:** 361572 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The wildlife that dwell on the GGNRA lands also must react to their instincts to avoid any predator. Dogs 'mark' where they roam. The wildlife will move from areas that are constantly marked by these predators. The negative impacts to the native wildlife are obvious.

Organization: Audubon Society-Marin County

Commenter: Richard A Fraites **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5689 **Comment Id:** 364158 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: So, I was hiking Miwok to Coyote Ridge Trail yesterday, in Tennessee Valley, and there were so many dogs. Wildlife viewing is nil. Just a few brave little sparrows. One woman got way ahead of her dog on the trail, and the dog was digging into some little creatures' burrow just off the trail. You can not depend upon owners to control their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine M Holmes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5813 **Comment Id:** 364353 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: One particular instance stands out while at Ocean Beach, San Francisco. While surfing I noticed a cormorant playing on the inside of the breaking waves, which caught the attention of an off-leash Labrador, I think. The dog chased the bird as it bobbed in and out of the water, ultimately, catching the bird. The owner's threats and commands to stop we're futile. After the bird was fetched back to the owner, I showed my disguised, and in response, the owner berated and hit his dog. In the end, the bird died.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

2. Commenters noted that in their experience they had rarely or never seen dogs harassing, disturbing, or killing wildlife. Some commenters felt that dogs may actually protect wildlife species by preventing predators from accessing threatened species, or by preventing wildlife from entering more urban areas.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 2691 **Comment Id:** 357083 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Almost all dog people prevent their dogs from chasing or in any way intimidating birds or other animals. Since dog people are gone by sunset, the little animals who live in these areas are then free to come out and live their nocturnal lives.
Organization:
Commenter: Melissa J Flower **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2800 **Comment Id:** 357503 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have very rarely if ever personally witnessed any serious conflicts with dogs and people, or dogs with wildlife. The vast, vast numbers of dog owners are extremeley responsible with their dogs who engage in harmless, fun activities.
Organization:
Commenter: Steven Baigel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3863 **Comment Id:** 359994 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There may well be some areas that have some birds but there is not any documentation of their great jeopardy from dogs at present.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard D Carrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361116 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I now see more wildlife, including bobcats, coyotes, rabbits and deer than I have ever seen before. There have even been reports of mountain lions. It goes to the fact that people, dogs and all kinds of wildlife can and do co-exist.
Organization:
Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4893 **Comment Id:** 361709 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is a myth that dogs are endangering other species. The gulls, crows, willets, comerants, sanderlings, snowy plovers, and other birds know how to survive with people, dogs and horses. This is an urban space they have chosen as their home.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne M Herbst **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5542 **Comment Id:** 363918 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: All dogs I encounter on the beach are well behaved and controlled by their owners. I have not encountered any instances of dogs harassing either wild life or other people. If anything, human impact from littering and walking on the dunes has a far greater negative impact on the beach wildlife than dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Chad R Plummer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5852 **Comment Id:** 364414 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My observation is that the dogs at Funston are well behaved and do not damage the environment. I have never seen dogs harass birds or other wildlife, and the overwhelming majority of people at Funston are meticulous about cleaning up after their dogs. Birds on the beach will move or fly off to a slightly different location if approached by dogs or humans.

Organization:

Commenter: George Theodoris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367541 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SDEIS states that dogs harass marine mammals at the beaches. However, the Marine Mammal Center has relied on dog walkers for years to inform them about stranded marine mammals on beaches - - these beneficial aspects of dog walkers should be taken into account in all fairness. The TMMC wrote an email letter to Jane Woodman in 2006 stating this information and is attached for your information. The dog walkers are the first responders when these marine mammals wash up on beaches because of illness or injury and TMMC depends on these sightings so if possible, they can help the distressed marine mammal in a timely manner.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Commenters questioned the wildlife resources described in the affected environment chapter of the SEIS. Some commenters questioned the numbers or presence of wildlife in areas of the GGNRA, while others noted that wildlife in these**

areas was adapted to dogs.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 252 **Comment Id:** 350357 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Fort Funston is, and has been the pre eminent dog exercise area in the Bay Area. The dominant plant species there is Iceplant, and the dominant soil there is sand. The wildlife is birds, and none of these three is damaged or disturbed by off leash dog activities.

Organization:

Commenter: Ronald L Giuntini **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1905 **Comment Id:** 354514 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: So, envision a place where there are lots of people, children, dogs, strollers, most in motion, active, even noisy. Any wildlife that could be harmed isn't likely to be revealing itself, wouldn't you think?

Organization:

Commenter: Amanda J Burton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2820 **Comment Id:** 357556 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs have been in the GGNRA - well - basically forever! But wildlife, plants, wild animals flourish in the park, if dogs were causing irreparable damage to the wilderness aspects of the park, would we not have seen effects by now?

Organization:

Commenter: Claus Schlund **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5020 **Comment Id:** 362020 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The only "wildlife" I ever observe on the beach are large ravens and sand pipers. Ravens are non-native predators that kill off native species - surely the NPS is not trying to protect the ravens. The sandpipers are too fast for any dog to catch.

Organization:

Commenter: Genevieve Coyle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364792 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mountain lions: My dog has found enough parts of adult deer to make it clear that a large predator forages in this area. The S.F. Chronicle has reported mountain lion sightings in this area, and the local paper again on Nov. 13th

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5959 **Comment Id:** 364806 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I suspect wildlife in this region also benefits form off leash hiking areas. It should be to recognized that GGNRA is part of a very large contiguous area of protected wild lands in San Mateo County. Abundant wildlife roams free here including mountain lions, coyotes, bobcats, and other predators. Human activity including responsible off leash dog hiking create a buffer between wild lands and the small discontinuous but densely populated communities adjacent to Rancho Corral de Tierra. When wildlife venture into town it seldom works out for wildlife. A buffer protects wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Glines **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6218 **Comment Id:** 366138 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I know the geese are not native and come down from Canada seasonally and I know the deer are over populated here so it seems that having dogs off leash should not be a problem. I totally understand wild life preserves and never take my dog anywhere that doesn't allow them for I respect nature and all animals.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368418 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Data from Beach Watch surveys (Beach Watch 2006; 2009) is used in the SEIS. Although the data from this survey may be appropriate to use to mention the presence and general abundance of certain species of shorebirds, there are severe limitations to this data. This data is based on encounter rates as were the Snowy Plover surveys done by GGNRA, so the data on shorebirds cannot be considered as an accurate survey of shorebird populations. The surveys were done every two weeks and may not have been conducted during peak migration periods and may have completely missed the presence of some bird species during migration and the peak number of individuals of various species during migration. Although some aspects of the data may be useful, I do not think it should be used to draw conclusions about the relative species numbers or the habitat importance between different sites

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 10 **Comment Id:** 337965 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off leash dogs dominate areas where they're permitted. They disturb and chase runners, hikers and brds alike. Muir beach is no longer used by residents without dogs because of the dogs roaming, sniffing, digging and pooping and their irreponsible owners inconsiderate behavior. Public properties that are allowed to become off leash areas become only suitable for dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 15 **Comment Id:** 337972 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I applaud the continued reasonable restrictions place on dog walking etc in our national parks/recreation areas. As a resident of San Francisco, I see daily problems with dog owners at Ocean Beach allowing their (illegally) off leash dogs to chase sea birds for hundreds of yards and to urinate all over areas where other users (children, surfers, etc) then lie on the sand. These area are national parks NOT DOG parks and someone needs to speak for the wildlife and other users aside from dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: charles masud **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 61 **Comment Id:** 338943 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: With regard to protecting the wildlife around East Beach, I've seen very few dogs interfer with the birds in the protected areas. But even those interferences could be prevented with better fencing and signage around the protected parts.

Organization:

Commenter: Menden Kibera **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 194 **Comment Id:** 350086 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs also disturb the birds that dwell on the beaches

Organization:

Commenter: nafiss griffis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 354 **Comment Id:** 350856 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs chase wildlife and dig into the gopher holes with no interference from their owners. The Crissy Field area should not be considered a city park but considered wildlife refuge.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 383 **Comment Id:** 351291 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am concerned about all the areas, but the area I visit most and can speak to is Ocean Beach. For the last few years I've gon fairly often, independently picking up trash and observing. Every time I go when I see shorebirds I see dogs chasing them. I often see bags of poop on the beach. The birds were here first, they are in decline, and they REALLY don't have alternatives. Their habitat is declining. We need to prioritize the migrating shorebirds, and most of all we need ENFORCEMENT. Realistically, dogs have other places to go. Realistically, the birds don't.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1002 **Comment Id:** 351400 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have seen all kinds of dog mischief out on Oak Valley trail and fire road, as well as Muir Beach. This includes digging, chasing animals and running through posted streams.
Organization:
Commenter: april post **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1035 **Comment Id:** 351460 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I understand that part of the concern is the impact on flora and fauna at the park. There are many areas in the park that are marked off for multiple reasons and access is blocked off. My experience has been that people are respectful of those boundaries.I suspect that the flora and fauna are doing just fine in those areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Arthur Storey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1046 **Comment Id:** 351478 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs and their owners have overun parts of the GGNRA. The presence of dogs is very detrimental to wildlife and especially shoreline and marsh habitats. Pets have no business in GGNRA, especially unleashed dogs, and they should be prohibited except to very limited sections of the GGNRA. Off leash dogs are a menace to nesting birds and other wildlife whose ranges have already been severely restricted. I urge the NPS to protect our natural resources by severely limiting, or banning, dogs from GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Edward J Lammer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1049 **Comment Id:** 351484 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: But any dog not on a leash should not be far from its owner and should be very responsive to its owner's commands. The one place where I have witnessed this scenario ineffectually has been in GGNRA in Marin; the Headlands. On several occasions I have seen dogs run off trail, through the brush, chasing wildlife. Owners have called to no effect. I believe this is not healthy for the local fauna as it does not allow them the safety of living in their homeland environment. In San Francisco, I have seen this far less except with the dog walkers.
Organization:
Commenter: S Polk **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1101 **Comment Id:** 351639 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am in favor of the NPS recommendations presented in the Draft Dog Management Plan. I am a resident of Homestead Valley and frequently hike in many of the areas effected by this plan. While I love dogs, I have all too often encountered dogs in prohibited areas where sensitive habitat and wildlife are impacted by off-leash dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 536 **Comment Id:** 351881 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: THIS DOESN'T WORK!! I've never been to O.B. when there were shore birds when at least one dog hasn't chased some. The birds need energy/calories to migrate. They're declining in numbers. They were here first and really have nowhere else to go.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1216 **Comment Id:** 352007 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition to people and dogs, the beaches are a resource for birds too, who get their food from the shoreline. I see them having to fly away from dogs, using their precious energy that they could be using to find something to eat.
Organization:
Commenter: Desi Perim **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1302 **Comment Id:** 352273 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: please do not ban dog walking on the proposed trails. dogs are low impact to

the environment. They are not bothering the wildlife, fauna and other trail users. We have 2 miniature dachsunds that we like to walk on the various trails.

Organization:

Commenter: garret goo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1382 **Comment Id:** 352421 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Regarding Muir Beach, Alternative A is my most preferred plan. Muir Beach has been a wonderful place for families of all types to come and enjoy nature, and keeping dogs on leash while being tempted by the cool ocean can be a bit torturous. I have never seen or experienced any type of destruction or disturbance of the native wildlife by dogs. If this has proven to be an issue, I would suggest better signage at these areas. In my experience, having dogs under voice control has proven effective for this area

Organization:

Commenter: MARY PETERSON **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1440 **Comment Id:** 352559 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: While it is possible that free roaming dogs in the GGNRA may scare some wild life, I suspect there is plenty of remote area that can act as a refuge, should it actually be proved that the dogs are a problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Chip Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 624 **Comment Id:** 352759 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have seen the damage dogs off leash can do to the beach,native plant areas, and bird resting,nesting and feeding.

Organization: California Native Plant Society

Commenter: Jean Conner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 685 **Comment Id:** 352942 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a volunteer with the Golden Gate Parks and work both at Crissy Field and in the Crissy Wildife Protection Area (WPA). I've seen firsthand the problems of bad dog owners (the dogs are fine, it's the people, of course!) letting their dogs harass wildlife, tear up the ground, transmit invasive plant seeds and bother people.

Organization:

Commenter: Cornelia Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 707 **Comment Id:** 352992 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am greatly concerned about the environmental impacts of off-leash dogs roaming our natural parkland. I have witnessed off-leash dogs chasing birds and other wild animals along our beaches and trails. I have also seen off-leash dogs chase runners, jump up on children and attack other dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1530 **Comment Id:** 353019 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It seems every time I'm at Crissy Field, I see a dog off leash and out of owner's control terrorizing the birds in the lagoon.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 750 **Comment Id:** 353122 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Have witnessed event on birding trip @Crissy Field about 2 years after the restoration work was opened for the public. A Grebe was beached & obviously unable to fly when her two dogs off lease charged @the bird & began barking @it. We told the woman to call in her dogs & lease them but they continued to avoid her. The bird was obviously in stress as it tried to prevent the dogs from coming closer. We even tried to help round them up. We finally had to cover the bird with our windbreaker & remove the bird as it was becoming exhausted from its efforts & found a box to transport it to rehab. The woman could not recognize the behavior of the bird's panting & inablility to escape from the lunging behavior of her two dogs. She was under the delusion that she had control of the dogs. They wouldn't "hurt" the bird. Her action reflect a common dog owner behavior: ignorance & denial.

Organization: CAS; GGRO

Commenter: Mamiko Kawaguchi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1606 **Comment Id:** 353184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I see dogs walked off-leash in the GGNRA part of Mori Point each week. These dogs race off the trail and scatter the birds and rabbits in the area. When I mention to owners that the dogs should be leashed, even those that comply release their dogs when I go on my way.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 795 **Comment Id:** 353303 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: One of the biggest hypocritical attitudes I have observed in most dog advocates is their total disregard for wildlife. I have observed many instances of dog owners allowing their dogs to chase wildlife, especially birds.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Tremblay **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1669 **Comment Id:** 353517 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Responsible dog owners don't let their dogs dig or hunt wildlife. I walk every day and have not seen severe destruction caused by dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Ceisel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1689 **Comment Id:** 353631 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In Marin County, different rules - a different philosophy - should apply; off-leash dogs are extremely unlikely to pose a substantive threat to the plants or animals which are already adapted both to a) the presence of dogs in the environment, and b) the relatively harsh conditions which exist specifically because the surrounding environment is a harsh one.

Organization:

Commenter: David E Gurley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1826 **Comment Id:** 354267 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have also witnessed them go after birds (including snowy plovers at Ocean Beach.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1832 **Comment Id:** 354289 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please BAN off-leash dogs from all of Ocean Beach. I surf there every morning and see many dogs attack or harass native birds. Native wildlife should be protected in the limited areas they have to live in near the city.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1833 **Comment Id:** 354292 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mostly, dogs run along the waterline leaving the rest of the beach alone. There is no flora growing at the water's edge on a sandy beach. Sensitive areas on the way to the beach are protected by enforceable dog leash laws. Similarly, the water's edge is not a sensitive wildlife habitat. The footprint of dogs is far smaller than the footprint of humans. There have been few documented incidents of dog damage to the environment.(e.g. I have never seen a dog with a Snowy Plover in its mouth).

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 1846 **Comment Id:** 354343 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs, by their nature, will sniff, chase, and dig. They are curious and unpredictable. They greatly harm birds, rodents, insects and other wildlife, either directly or by disturbing their habitat or food sources. Domestic dogs should not be allowed to destroy what little is left.

Organization:

Commenter: G M **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1892 **Comment Id:** 354473 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The balance we need will require greater restrictions on dogs and their owners than we currently have. The status quo seems to be off leash dogs everywhere. It horrifies me to see dog owners knowingly let their dogs harass wildlife, especially young, and vulnerable birds. It is very stressful for them and probably ends up in premature death.

Organization:

Commenter: Sharon Reeve **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1901 **Comment Id:** 354503 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The big problem continues to be lax enforcement of existing regulations. I cannot tell you how many times I have been trying to photograph rare and/or sensitive birds or animals and have had inconsiderate dog owners allow their dogs to terrorize the birds and animals right in front of me. And when I point out that the area is posted that dogs must be on leash they just laugh.

Organization:

Commenter: Joseph Morlan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1909 **Comment Id:** 354527 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are destructive to the very things that so many of us come to the national parks to experience: wildlife and the peace that only nature can provide; a respite from city life.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1936 **Comment Id:** 354579 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Hello, I strongly support protecting wildlife by limiting dogs (especially off-leash dogs) in the GGNRA. I have had to greatly limit where I go hiking and bird-watching. Time and time again, even in on-leash only areas, I have seen dogs chasing wildlife while the owners ignored this behavior or, in some cases, encouraged it.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeanine E Strobel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1944 **Comment Id:** 354587 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Allowing dogs off leash is incompatible with a nature experience, such as bird watching. I often walk along the bluffs in Half Moon Bay, and many times have seen off-leash dogs chase blue herons, egrets and other birds along the bluffs. Our bird populations, native plants, etc. are under severe strain, and allowing dogs to roam freely in these sensitive habitat areas is, to me, completely incompatible with nature preservation/restoration.
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Petrosky **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1962 **Comment Id:** 354620 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I've watched dogs chase shorebirds from their safe wintering areas along our shorelines. Yes, the birds return when the chase if over but that doesn't mean it hasn't been stressful or dangerous to them. It takes energy that is better used for foraging for food or keeping warm or resting, when forced to fly away from a dog. The GGNRA is a wintering area to many birds that nest in other areas. If their wintering area is not safe because of off leash dogs, they will not survive to return to their nesting areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Malec **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2004 **Comment Id:** 354674 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs running free become dominant and the amount of bird life present when dogs are present is greatly diminished. The bird life in the beach areas of the GGNRA is prolific and it's unfortunate to see the birds less present when the dogs are running on the beach and in the surf unchecked. Signs at Rodeo Beach and Muir Beach indicating that dogs should be checked due to wildlife are largely ignored by dog owners.
Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2109 **Comment Id:** 355737 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I disagree with the premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area.
Organization:
Commenter: Denise F Selleck **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2609 **Comment Id:** 356872 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I've also seen wildlife molested at Baker Beach, and I suspect it was done by dogs, though I am not sure of that: mussels are removed from the cliffs at the far south end and strewn on the sand, sometimes as far north as the creek.
Organization:
Commenter: Rebecca A Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2624 **Comment Id:** 356927 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The only conflicts I have directly observed is dogs and birds. Studies were done and restrictions were put in place. I make a point myself to educate dog owners if I see their dogs disturbing any of the local wildlife.
Organization:
Commenter: Matthew J Jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2646 **Comment Id:** 356985 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When I go to the San Francisco Bay shore and want to observe the shorebirds in their natural habitat, I am dismayed by unleashed dogs who come bounding along, chasing shorebirds and scaring others off. After all, it's their natural habitat, not the dog's.
Organization:
Commenter: Sandy Thacker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2746 **Comment Id:** 357172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am heartened by the willingness of the NPS to devise regulations on rights of dogs in GGNRA that will allow other species their 'rights' also. I have often witnessed off-leash dogs running vigorously through areas that are vital habitat for wild species. It is wonderful to see dogs in unrestrained motion, as I know from years of living with dogs, but owners who do not restrain their dogs in designated areas, where other species strive to survive, are denying

those creatures their livelihood

Organization:

Commenter: Ellen @ Barth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2746 **Comment Id:** 357180 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On beaches where dogs are not leashed, though required, I have been knocked down by racing dogs, had food snatched from my hand, have been peed* on while sitting and watching waves and birds. I have seen owners urge their racing dogs (Limantour) to chase into four flocks of 800 resting shorebirds and cheer their ability scatter them. *On one occasion, I spoke to park personnel shortly afterwards, and was told that dogs are territorial and acted badly sometimes....

Organization:

Commenter: Ellen @ Barth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2785 **Comment Id:** 357454 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs have not been regulated in the GGNRA at the expense of wildlife, habitat and visitors. I have observed dogs chasing birds at Crissy Field on the beach and on the lawn on several occasions over the last 6-plus years

Organization:

Commenter: Lynn Strandberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2809 **Comment Id:** 357531 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Almost all dog people prevent their dogs from chasing or in any way intimidating birds or other animals. Since dog people are gone by sunset, the little animals who live in these areas are then free to come out and live their nocturnal lives.

Organization:

Commenter: Melissa J Flower **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2851 **Comment Id:** 357632 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: "Voice control" is always a myth that makes any enforcement impossible. One often sees owners shrieking at their dogs to no avail especially in the ubiquitous dog fights that one sees in all parks. Or owners who ineffectually tell their dogs not to destroy the turf by digging but allow much destruction or pursuit of birds.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3146 **Comment Id:** 357929 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The fact that the rules regarding leash restriction are not currently followed with regularity shows that dog owners in this area too often show disregard for the well being of species and habitats that the National Park Service was created to protect. Even with the introduced new restrictions to dog access, San Francisco and Marin provide more open space and beach access for dogs and dog owners than any other coastal city in the United States of which I am aware.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael W Saxton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3333 **Comment Id:** 358160 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have witnessed harassment of wildlife by off-leash dogs several times in the GGNRA, and I have been harassed myself by off-leash dogs. In fact, I avoid areas in the GGNRA where dogs are allowed to run by their owners

Organization:

Commenter: Andrew C Rush **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3334 **Comment Id:** 358170 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I often go birding in golden Gate Park, the Presidio, Ocean Beach, El Polin Springs, and Glen Park Canyon. In all of these places I see dogs running through wildlife habitat chasing birds and trammeling native plants and shrubs and owners willfully letting them.

Organization: JeepNey Projects Worldwide

Commenter: David Tomb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3346 **Comment Id:** 358197 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Over the years I have seen how dogs have severely eroded Fort Funston's grounds and how dog lovers enjoy watching their pets chase foraging birds on the beaches. How will Kildeer and Snowy Plovers lay eggs with romping dogs everywhere? Knowing how hard that is on the wildlife makes me deeply sad. Some species are getting driven out of San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Virginia Stearns **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3350 **Comment Id:** 358217 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Monday I was walking in Crissy Field. There was a great blue heron in the marsh. A dog kept barking at it, scaring the creature. If it was not fenced, the dog would have

attacked the bird. The bird is only protected behind the fence and is not free to roam, as dogs are always running around that area.

Organization:

Commenter: Marsha Seeley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3362 **Comment Id:** 358236 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I regularly go to Ocean beach to walk. I have never ever seen a dog on leash. I regularly see dogs chase birds. I also have seen on numerous occasions where someone just buries their dogs poo in the sand!!! Excuse me, but little kids and adults like to dig in the sand. These people seem to think it doesn't matter.

Organization: Private user

Commenter: Cathy Ritter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3365 **Comment Id:** 358252 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: First and foremost, the GGNRA should be for the people to enjoy the native flora and fauna found there. Not to be terrorized by dogs racing around off leash. Dogs and their owners have gotten out of control. Please enforce some semblance of dog control. Parks are for people.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3367 **Comment Id:** 358254 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have personally witnessed birds being routed out and chased by an off-leash dog while the owner is totally obivious to it or the poop that it is leaving behind. The area being considered for no off-leash is small compared to the amount of areas that are available to them. Please allow the wildlife of the GGNRA to exist without the invasion and trauma of dogs off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean L Reinys **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3390 **Comment Id:** 358311 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs do more than just scare away wildlife, they kill wildlife, their owners neglect to clean up properly after them which creates a dirty smelly environment, which also can spread disease. Dogs can be aggressive to children as well and may fight with eachother. In general they disturb the peaceful quiet use of the GGNRA and threaten the very wildlife we go there to enjoy

Organization: Ms.

Commenter: laura woodford **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3391 **Comment Id:** 358314 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: An important reason why people visit parks is the serenity and beauty there. Many dog owners are respectful of others and many dogs are well-trained. But San Francisco also has its share of irresponsible dog owners, and out-of-control dogs. This can be a threat, not only for our varied wildlife, but also for our citizens, especially children and seniors. Also the presence of too many dogs degrades the natural environment of the park. We all deserve a place where we can relax and enjoy our precious coastline without being disrupted by unruly dogs and their natural instincts to chase after wildlife - or people
Organization:
Commenter: Amy Haskell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3548 **Comment Id:** 359181 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Too often out-of-control dogs are allowed to chase birds, rabbits and other wildlife in a National Park. While recreating is a pat of the park, harassing natural resources is not.
Organization:
Commenter: Chris Briggs **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3436 **Comment Id:** 359226 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am a frequent visitor to the GGNRA, both on foot and by kayak. I am vocal in insisting that fellow kayakers avoid disturbing birds and other marine organisms along the shoreline and I expect dog-owners to have the same respect for our natural resources. It pains me to see dogs running off leash after flocks of shorebirds, some of which are in the process of migrating from arctic Canada or Alaska to the southern cone of South America. Being chased by dogs depletes the energy reserves of these birds engaged in one of the most spectacular behaviors we can observe on our planet.
Organization:
Commenter: Ellen L Simms **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3440 **Comment Id:** 359238 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a walker and grandoarent, i want to be able to explore the area without concern for loose dogs that can run after me or my small grandkids. I am a long time dog owner and recognize the need to exercise dogs but for the safety of public visitors and nature, dogs need to be exercised in enclosed areas. My dogs if loose would routinely chase any birds or waterfowl on the ground, it is in their wiring. We are losing our local birds as a result of encroaching in

their habitats. Loose digs further threaten the survival of indigenous and migrating birds.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea W Cassidy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3717 **Comment Id:** 359393 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I frequently have been disturbed to watch off leash dogs chasing birds from feeding in their natural habitats at Tennessee cove or racing after rabbits along various GGNRA trails in Southern Marin.

Organization:

Commenter: Julie Bongers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3841 **Comment Id:** 359969 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Urine and feces are damaging not just to the environment, but children are reluctant to get down on their hands and knees to explore when the area is soiled and smelly. And of course, what little wildlife there is, is scarcer and more skittish in areas where dogs are allowed - even in on-leash areas

Organization:

Commenter: N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3938 **Comment Id:** 360088 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The mouth of Redwood Creek at Muir Beach is an important wildlife habitat. Not only is the creek and marsh area important for the threatened Coho Salmon and Red-Legged Frog, but many other species use the area as well. For example, the creek mouth, front lagoon, and adjacent beach area are used as resting and refugia areas for many species of gulls and shorebirds. The refugia during onshore storms are particularly important for these species. However, pressure from off-leash dogs and their owners typically flushes gulls, herons, and other birds first thing in the morning. In addition, a family of River Otters which now resides in the creek system often feeds in the front lagoon and beach area, but not when there is pressure from dogs and people. Raccoons and Mule Deer are also common in the willows near the mouth.

Organization:

Commenter: DAVID M MACKENZIE **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3957 **Comment Id:** 360172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I watched a woman let her 2 dogs run directly over Snowy Plover habitat at San Francisco's Ocean beach while the birds were there. When she ran back up to the board walk, I courteously asked if she was aware of the sign and the leash requirement, and how the birds were startled by the dogs. Without stopping, No, she said, didn't see the sign, and ran off.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Roberta Guise **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3966 **Comment Id:** 360229 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In all of those years, our dogs have never injured wildlife or frightened a horse on the trail. It is a fire road, with plenty of room for all. We share it with joggers, mountain bikers and hikers quite happily. Yet we will lose access to this trail if Alternative F is adopted. Our quality of life - every week - will be adversely affected.
Organization:
Commenter: anne c harper **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3969 **Comment Id:** 360296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As an avid birdwatcher, it is distressing to watch the dogs run wild in sensitive environments. From my own experience, there are fewer and fewer birds returning to areas where they were once in abundance.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4004 **Comment Id:** 360444 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I hike in Headlands above Marin city now. It is covered in dog poop. dogs are all off leash, running and jumping on hikers. the owners think it is cute when they flush baby quail out of the brush or chase after wildlife.
Organization:
Commenter: Gail Thames **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4073 **Comment Id:** 360663 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dog owners love their animals. They love them so much they will let them do terrible harm to the environment and to wildlife and believe they are in the right to do so. Many dog owners simply don't realize how much damage their individual pet can do. And en masse the hordes of dogs completely disrupt an already troubled ecosystem. Some dog owners will keep their dogs on leash in wild and semi-wild habitats, but most will not, even when they know it's against the law. They think it's natural for their animal to romp with other dogs, as well as pursue wild birds and animals. And it *is* natural for their dogs to do these things, but it's also incredibly destructive.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon
Commenter: Karen C Burke-Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4602 **Comment Id:** 361128 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am all for any and all dog bands! Every single time I've gone camping up in Marin Headlands people are walking there dogs where they shouldn't be. Scaring wild life, leaving feces and diseases for wild life to be infected with. Twice a dog walker let here dogs just start running around my campsite nosing in my tent and food. We need to do everything we can to lessen the canines impact in fragile areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Webster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4657 **Comment Id:** 361190 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Every week I see evidence of "responsible" dog owners who leave their pet's feces on trails, or allow their offleash pets to go tearing through the brush. Believe me, I am not a dog hater. I've had dog pets and enjoy my friend's dogs. I just believe they are not a part of a natural environment.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4660 **Comment Id:** 361286 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Often, when I am trying to bird watch, dogs will run up to me,circle, bark, jump up or nuzzle me between the legs. Dog owners do not have their dogs under voice control and often are apologetic or just use the excuse that it's only a puppy. This is very distracting and often frieghtening to me not to mention scaring all the birds away.

Organization:

Commenter: Ralph V Pericoli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4665 **Comment Id:** 361292 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The people are happy, the dogs are happy and, as evidenced by recent sightings, the wildlife is happy. Apparently river otters have been seen repeatedly.

Organization:

Commenter: Francis Kilmartin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4713 **Comment Id:** 361374 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Before people were here, beaches were very attractive to birds and other wildlife because they were vast areas with few predators, and so allowed ground-nesting birds like the Snowy Plover safe places to raise their young. Now with 6 million people in the Bay Area, and who knows how many dogs and other commensals, we have taken over that habitat

and left these species nearly no place to reproduce.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Alan Harper **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4722 **Comment Id:** 361386 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs off leash on trails or running on beaches hurt wildlife and lessen the visitor experience. When I visit the trails and the beaches I yearn to experience the park in a natural state without dogs chasing wildlife and mauling children.
Organization:
Commenter: Kevin S Stockmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4780 **Comment Id:** 361513 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As it is, I regularly see dog owners violating existing restrictions, letting their dogs off leash on trails where this is forbidden, and bringing their dogs into areas where they are not supposed to be, leashed or otherwise. These dogs then run off the trails and deep into the surrounding hillsides, disturbing any possibility of sanctuary for the wild animals who live there, and when on the beaches, relentlessly chase any shorebirds that are present, making it impossible for them to rest or forage for food.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Welwood **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4897 **Comment Id:** 361720 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In a small lake this last weekend in Golden Gate Park, two Pied-billed Grebes splashed and charged each other in an early territorial display, a Snowy Egret, Great Egret and Great Blue Heron were fishing at the edge, and numerous American Coots were swimming around. I was looking for an American Bittern, a more rare bird that occasionally frequents a small bath of reeds here. This natural scene (and any chance of seeing the bittern) was completely disrupted by an unleashed dog that jumped in the water and charged the birds - the egrets and heron flew away and the grebes scrambled for safety. The dog's owner paid no attention to the wildlife and ensuing disruption; he was oblivious to how much this ruined the enjoyment of the lake for others. It is sad that such places of refuge for wildlife and small snippets of tranquility are destroyed by irresponsible dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4956 **Comment Id:** 361830 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am also very concerned about the local wildlife, since lots of dogs can be seen

in the underbrush , often unattended. When I started walking this trail more than 3 years ago I spotted bobcats several times, but did not see them since many months now.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 4975 **Comment Id:** 361880 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the 5 years that I have walked my dog daily off leash (over 9,000 hours) I have seen exactly 2 instances where dogs have actually done damage to another creature.

Organization: Sierra Club

Commenter: Annemarie A Donjacour **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4983 **Comment Id:** 361890 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The presence of large numbers of hyperactive dogs is damaging to these resources. They harass birds and trample plants. They interfere with other people's pleasure, making some areas unusable for large numbers of people.

Organization: California Native Plant Society Yerba Buena Chapter

Commenter: Jake Sigg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5053 **Comment Id:** 362122 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Allowing dogs to scare and chase wildlife, and poop all over (or leave plastic bags all over)takes a big toll on our wild lands and wildlife. Too many times I have witnessed dogs running after deer, squirrels, birds and other animals. Many of our bird species are migratory. Every time they fly off the water or nest takes energy- the energy they are should be storing up for their migration which can be 1000s of miles.

Organization:

Commenter: Sharon A Barnett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5137 **Comment Id:** 362265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I watched over the course of a few years as more and more dogs trampled that huge coffeeberry into oblivion. The Park Service stood by and did nothing to save the plant or even to collect berries so the gene pool of that remarkable plant could be preserved. Too late now. Not only is that plant gone, so too are most of the shrubs that provided habitat around the Y grove, Battery Davis and the Skyline grove. The smaller shrubs were stomped down, the larger ones seem to have succumbed to the constant flow of dog urine inflicted upon them. The ground dwelling animals are gone too. Jackrabbits, California Quail and Spotted Towhees are all gone. It is likely they were chased to the point they could no longer reproduce, so either left for other places or just lived out their lives until their species were extirpated. I do not know the fate of the

brush rabbits, but I haven't seen any in many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan and Dan Murphy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5137 **Comment Id:** 362267 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: They chase huge numbers of migrating birds off the beach and send them on their way north or south at a stage when they should be resting on the beach or feeding along the tide line. They do the same thing to gulls, terns, Snowy Plovers, Sanderlings and other shorebirds that reside here during some part of the year.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan and Dan Murphy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5222 **Comment Id:** 362677 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs absolutely love the beach: they are often not under voice control because they are so excited to be running in the dunes and along or in the water. And many, many times, I have seen dogs chasing the birds at the edge of the water, while the dog owners do nothing to control the dog's behavior. And many times, I have politely asked the dog owners to control or leash their dog, and am met with indifference, or "this is the first time he's ever done this" (followed by inaction), or occasional, grudging leashing of the dog

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5251 **Comment Id:** 362811 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have never seen a dog fight or any person be harmed by a dog. I have seen families, couples, and professional dog walkers, all enjoying the ocean and the trails. I have never seen a dog digging in the dunes or disturbing the birds nesting in the cliffs.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Nightingale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362892 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my many days at Crissy, I have never seen dogs chasing birds. They leave each other alone. There is a large group of geese that visit the big lawn regularly and this provides an environmental concern greater than the very rare and occasional dog (or even human!) poop. When our son was exposed to goose poop, he suffered serious diahrea that required antibiotic treatment.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5311 **Comment Id:** 362948 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs in national parks are incompatible with multiple use activities such as nature viewing. Dogwalkers often fail to observe leash laws and voice control regulations. I have often observed off leash dogs in flushing wild birds.
Organization:
Commenter: Marjorie R Siegel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5391 **Comment Id:** 363042 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Many favorite trails are now overrun with off leash dogs that are not command responsive or may respond "sometimes". When chasing rabbits or squirrels or birds, commands are ignored by the majority of canines. These trails are no longer pleasant and instead intimidating, as one never knows when they will encounter an animal that is often wary and nervous. Dog fights on trails are not uncommon, likely due to nervous or territorial dogs.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon
Commenter: Leora Feeney **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363175 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off-leash dogs at the GGNRA have harmed park visitors. Off-leash dogs have been involved in many dog fights and dog bites at the GGNRA. Off-leash dogs have been injured at the GGNRA falling off steep cliffs. Charging and growling off-leash dogs frighten visitors and hamper their ability to enjoy the GGNRA. Running dogs off-leash at the GGNRA puts the welfare of wildlife at great risk. Off-leash dogs are more likely to leave behind dog feces in the park, reducing the recreational value of the GGNRA
Organization:
Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5443 **Comment Id:** 363268 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I strongly oppose the preferred alternative in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I regularly take my dog to Crissy Field and other GGNRA areas. My dog Olive loves to run and play fetch off leash. She is very well behaved and responsive to verbal commands, so is never in danger of harming off-trail wildlife. Depriving her of and I of this activity is a major blow to each of us and our respective physical and mental health.
Organization:
Commenter: Lauren T Gehman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5446 **Comment Id:** 363287 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As such, I have witnessed dogs chasing endangered species (snowy plovers) as well as migratory shorebirds (willets, gulls, terns, marbled godwits, sanderlings) foraging to build up strength for their journey. I've even seen dogs walking along the rock revetment at the south end of the beach barking at nesting bank swallows. They shouldn't be subjected to the threat of dogs, especially in a National Park.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5606 **Comment Id:** 364004 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGNRA needs to educate dog owners about the damage their pets do when they chase shorebirds. I have stopped going to the southern portion of Ocean Beach (including the supposed Snowy Plover areas) because it is too upsetting. People allow (and even encourage) their huge dogs to chase shorebirds. Birds and other wildlife in GGNRA deserve to also have space where they can rest, forage and live without constant disturbance and fear of death.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen A Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5632 **Comment Id:** 364048 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs frighten off wildlife in the park. They chase birds. They are the only park 'visitors' that routinely defecate and urinate in the park. They bite people! Children who are at face level with most of the dogs in the park are at risk from dog attacks while playing in the park. Dogs bark. The tranquility of a day in the park is disturbed by the presence of dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: georgina j monahan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5737 **Comment Id:** 364202 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If it weren't for the bad behavior of some dog owners and canines that can not be controlled, I would be opposed to the banning of dogs to the proposed areas. I have seen children feeling threatened by dogs and dogs chasing birds. It is reasonable to regulate access to dogs in National Parks. Please implement the plan. It is thoughtful and protective.

Organization:

Commenter: Piper Cafferata **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5776 **Comment Id:** 364284 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have always felt that dogs off leash, even if responsive to vocal control, have been a problem. I have witnessed them chasing shorebirds and approaching stranded marine

mammals so many times I can't even count. I am the owner of a small dog who is always on leash and has been rushed up on by larger dogs off leash, which frighten both of us.

Organization:

Commenter: S L P **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5828 **Comment Id:** 364367 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Imagine all the pent up energy and not being able to run and play. If you change the current rules my dogs who love to swim will be unable to do so. They are hurting no fish and no nature when they swim and cannot see any damage they do to sand on a beach. Incidents of bad dog behavior are very infrequent and most mean dog owners do not bring their animals to places like this.

Organization:

Commenter: William Shore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5885 **Comment Id:** 364461 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Aside from harrasing humans and leashed dogs, I have observed uncontrolled pets chasing birds, running through and pooping in naturaly sensitive areas, digging for gophers and voles in erosion vunnerable trail banks, attacking ducks at El Polin, and herons, seagulls, and numerous shorebirds at Crissy field as well as on the beaches. I once saw a large dog get dangerously close to a great blue heron at Ft Scott, ending the magnificent bird's patient and graceful hunt for a meal.

Organization:

Commenter: andrew morrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5941 **Comment Id:** 364758 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Any instances of dogs harming birds are very rare and unusual, this can be addressed by proper dog training. As for disturbing the nesting sights this can be addressed through education and signage. The FERREL CATS are the problem here, please spend your time and MY money on addressing this much more significant problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Vivien MacDonald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6055 **Comment Id:** 365265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have watched countless moments when handicapped people, children, other pets, as well as birds, are frightened by roving off-leash dogs. I also watch the degradation of the ground and ground cover by uncontrolled dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Eugenie Marek **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6114 **Comment Id:** 365438 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The running loose of the dogs is not good for the beach. It is harmful to the carefully restored natural areas. It is a death sentence for the birds. It makes no sense at all. Allowing it is just giving in to the self-indulgent, selfishness of the dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie J Friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6204 **Comment Id:** 366008 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I enjoy the wild landscape and the wildlife of the GGNRA. Any day on the beach dogs can be seen chasing birds that are feeding, forcing them to fly off. And dog waste is frequently left, especially in wilder areas where the dogs go off the trail but the owners don't leave the trail to pick up the waste.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6239 **Comment Id:** 366161 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: dogs and dog owners are increasingly polluting the hiking/walking/running landscape. Stepping on dog poop is an every week and frequently everyday phenomenon. Exercising, yoga, circuit training, playing catch, kicking the soccer ball, playing frisbee are mightily constrained by the presence of dogs and dog poop. Dog owners and dog walkers do forget to clean up after their animal. Cryptosporidiosis proliferates...dog barking is irritating...dogs scare deer aw
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366916 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: And it's not just Bank Swallows and Snowy Plovers that are negatively impacted by dogs in GGNRA. Too many times I have witnessed off-leash dogs in NPS areas chasing after and harassing birds and other wildlife. A friend has related to me how, on a weekly basis, she witnesses a professional dog walker release up to 6 dogs to run and chase each other and wildlife in Oakwood Valley, trampling and tearing up the host plant to the endangered mission blue butterfly. I've heard other friends describe witnessing off-leash dogs in national parks attacking or harassing pinnipeds and chasing after shorebirds, including the threatened Snowy Plover. These reports lend more validation to the argument that dogs- -especially off-leash dogs- -have no place in national parks.

Organization:
Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6624 **Comment Id:** 367485 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And of course, the shorebirds along the beaches are impacted the most by the loose running of dogs along the beaches, especially the snowy plovers.
Organization:
Commenter: Heather Evergreen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6626 **Comment Id:** 367492 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In the parks without dogs or people bothering wildlife, I have seen a live wildcat, and a wild lion. Both were great to see. I see them in our zoo, but it is not the same thrill. I have seen lion tracks probably made by a young male at a gard pit area in San Carlos. Two of my great nephews were so thrilled just to measue the length of their strides and kow they have seen it.
Organization:
Commenter: Betty Pollock **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6648 **Comment Id:** 368220 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This includes enforcing laws banning dogs from certain areas of the park. In my 7 years as an HRT volunteer in the Marin Headlands, I have seen, first hand, how the increasing number of illegal dogs, even on a leash can harm natural habitat, jumping at quail, relieving themselves on native plants, and barking at visitors.
Organization:
Commenter: Jim Morrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6583 **Comment Id:** 368862 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I've seen dogs running and chasing water foul, snowy Plow other shorebirds and clapper Rail in where they must be on leash an in some areas where they not allowed at all.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Stevenson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/10/2014)

WH4000 Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives (Substantive)

1. **Commenters had concerns about impacts of dogs on wildlife, including dogs impacting bird energy reserves and foraging. Some commenters felt the impacts analysis did not adequately address the impacts of dogs on wildlife.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 219 **Comment Id:** 350135 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition to the recreational issue is the issue of wildlife compatibility. While I have statistics on human use, my findings on wildlife use are more incidental based on observations of sign (e.g., scat and tracks) and direct observations of wild animals. In areas that have heavy use of unleashed dogs, it appears that the use of these areas by small and medium mammals and especially carnivores such as weasels, skunks, raccoons, foxes, and even coyotes is vastly diminished.

Organization:

Commenter: Roger D Harris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 617 **Comment Id:** 352741 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog owners don't understand the impact that their dogs have on wildlife. When dogs chase shorebirds, for example, they not only have the potential to catch and kill them (as one did last year to two goslings). They also are, demonstrably, halting the bird's necessary foraging activities. The birds have nowhere else to go to forage and roost.

Organization:

Commenter: Kimberly Jannarone **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 663 **Comment Id:** 352855 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Another point is wildlife. Dogs disrupt areas that are habitat, mostly nesting sites for birds. Unmanaged dogs can do even more damage to the environment. Birds are the most harassed animal species, shorebirds in particular. Shorebirds do not nest in trees; preferred nesting sites are in sand dunes and grasses above tidal areas. Dogs will walk over nests, chase birds, kill adult birds, exhaust the bird's energy resulting in death, and frighten nesting birds to the point of those birds not going back to the nesting site. If there are chicks or eggs present, death of the young will occur. A prime example is the Western Snowy Plover (Charadrius nivosus nivosus) (Foster 2006). This bird is protected under the Endangered Species Act and as such, disruption from dogs can lead to large fines for the owner and possible destruction of the dog if the same problem of harassing or harming of federally protected animals is a common

occurrence. Dogs may also attack small mammals, amphibians, or reptiles which can be found in recreational parks and trails (National Park Service).

Organization:

Commenter: Faith Wall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4110 **Comment Id:** 361445 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs startle and harass wildlife and and can disturb humans. A UC Berkeley study in the Eastshore State Park found that dogs consistently startle and chase migratory birds away from their foraging and resting, as well as harass and disturb nesting birds away from their crucial activities.

Organization: Audubon

Commenter: Corinne Louise Greenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5151 **Comment Id:** 362283 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS fails to adequately state the impact of off leash dogs on wildlife. There have been many incidences in the GGNRA of wildlife killed by dogs. Countless studies, at least one by the GGNRA itself, have documented the adverse effects off leash dogs have on wildlife.I myself have never been to Ocean Beach without witnessing the harassment of shorebirds by a series of dogs. Yet these impacts on natural resources is given too scant attention in the SEIS and not enough weight put on preventing stress to wildlife.

Organization: International Urban Estuary Network/Save the Bay

Commenter: Arlene Gemmill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5445 **Comment Id:** 363284 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The evident assumption that dogs that are under voice control will indeed be under control leads to the EIR grossly understating the impacts of dogs in areas where they would be permitted off-leash under some of the plans. Areas that permit off-leash dogs will experience substantial declines in terms of wildlife and bird habitat. This should be acknowledged.

Organization:

Commenter: Phillip Price **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6474 **Comment Id:** 368829 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off-leash dogs can be a serious safety risk and are a huge disturbance to the increasingly smaller numbers of wildlife that remain in the GGNRA. There is no easy way to balance human pets and wildlife in the GGNRA, but the scientific evidence presented by the National Park Service and independent experts clearly point to the conclusion that dogs must be

on leash or excluded from any GGNRA area where endangered and threatened wildlife and their habitat, plus native plants, have been documented.

Organization:

Commenter: Celeste Langille **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters questioned impacts analysis of dogs on wildlife, and many noted that the impacts analysis overstates the impact of dogs on wildlife. Some commenters requested that less stringent or restrictive alternatives or changes be chosen based on the impacts from dogs on wildlife.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 526 **Comment Id:** 351867 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a birder and a dog owner who has visited Fort Funston for 2 decades. Question: why close area at FOOT of bluff when swallows are nesting? Dogs do not bother swallows, who are fast aerial. If anything is to be closed to people dogs, it should be the TOP of the bluffs, to avoid crumbling. Point (not about swallows, but about other species that nest in scrub): DOGS EXCLUDE FERAL CATS. If you get rid of dogs, you will have a cat problem, as in Golden Gate Park.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1203 **Comment Id:** 351969 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We believe that the wildlife of Marin County has enough protected land to exist without taking more away from dog owners. If this is not the case we would like to see scientific evidence of this.

Organization:

Commenter: JP H Salz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 632 **Comment Id:** 352780 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The proposal to ban dogs on Crissy Field in order to protect wildlife/sensitive species is not consistent with the regular use of Crissy Field as an event space (e.g. for races/walks, Fleet Week, etc.).The document needs to be modified to present the impacts of dogs in proper context of all other uses of these same spaces. The document mischaracterizes dog's presence in the Wildlife Protection Area (beach at the west end of Crissy Field). In my experience, dog owners are very mindful of not allowing their dogs to enter the WPA, and even remind other dog owners who may inadvertently let their dogs in the WPA that dogs are not allowed during most of the year. The document needs to modify its characterization of dog presence in the WPA.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Block **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 989 **Comment Id:** 354363 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The justification given in the Fall 2013 Draft Dog Management Plan for requiring dogs to be on-leash on Muir Beach is the need to protect sensitive habitat (p. 113, and Table 6, p. 256). However, that report does not establish that dogs, which have been using Muir Beach under voice control since 1979, have damaged the environment or harmed wildlife at Muir Beach. To the contrary, Table 14 (p. 315) reports only one dog-related incident of wildlife disturbance over a four year period. And the beach itself has not been damaged by dogs playing there.

Organization:

Commenter: Carl Shapiro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4551 **Comment Id:** 360595 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In Marin especially, many residents live near the GGNRA and have dogs without a lot of other places to take them. Obviously, if we were to turn the entire GGNRA into a dog park for a million canines a day, that would be a problem. But finding a few places where they can run won't kill massive numbers of birds or cause the extinction of severely endangered species of fauna and flora.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Golden **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5270 **Comment Id:** 362847 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In general, characterization of dog-related issues in the SEIS is misleading. The SEIS document has failed to provide evidence that dog walking is resulting in conflicts and resource degradation. From 2008 through 2011, a total of 1,537 dog-related incidents associated with natural resources occurred at GGNRA according to Table 6 in the SEIS. However, out of a total of 1,537 dog-related incidents, there were only three incidents of dogs destroying vegetation. Meanwhile, there were only 15 dog-related incidents of dogs disturbing wildlife. 1,519 incidents were related to dogs being off-leash in on-leash areas or dogs being in closed areas-incidents that could be attributed to lack of public education and signage by GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine C Cowdery **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5727 **Comment Id:** 364190 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I was particularly suprised to hear about some of these access-threatened locations, because there is very little wildlife in them to protect. Crissy field is a lawn, not wilderness. Fort Funston and Ocean Beach have no plant life. These restrictions feel very arbitrary in the public eye and do not seem to serve the greater good.

Organization:
Commenter: Beth L **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1071 **Comment Id:** 368732 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Invalid assumptions regarding Protecting Wildlife One of the main objectives of the Management Plan states that it is to protect native wildlife and their habitat, which includes harassment or disturbance by dogs. Other uses of GGNRA lands (e.g. hiking, biking, hang-gliding, horseback riding) have a greater impact than dog walking and their access is not being limited or addressed. Birds and other wildlife have the rest of the California coast to make their home, while San Francisco needs a place to exercise a growing dog population. We talked about ground-nesting birds being at risk because of off-leash dogs in the area, yet raccoons, coyotes, and humans are just as detrimental.The birds don't appear to be scared of dogs. If you ever watch a dog swimming or running towards one, they wait until the last minute before moving, and then only move a short distance away. The birds appear as if they're teasing the dogs. The birds, in all honesty, seem to be playing with the dogs. Any of the areas where dogs would be restricted on the premise that dogs are impacting wildlife are currently doing well, despite the fact that dogs are present there. It has not been shown that removing dogs from the GGNRA will have a beneficial impact on wildlife in the park. Wildlife has adjusted over time to dogs so they are no longer viewed as a threat, and dogs are not impacting wildlife. The SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.
Organization:
Commenter: Janet Slissman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. Commenters questioned the scientific studies used to justify impacts in the SEIS, or noted that impacts were due to other factors.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 655 **Comment Id:** 352834 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Every bit of 'science' GGNRA has provided as a reason to prohibit dogs has been shown to be faulty. Case in point: "Shadows from dogs running above the cliffs frighten the cliff swallows." There are no shadows cast from above the cliffs. The sun rises in the East and sets in the West making it impossible. The ravens, now almost the only birds present, do harass all the other birds. There were once swallows, sparrows, finches, hawks, even occasionally great horned owls there. None were discouraged by dogs. Ravens, encouraged by misguided humans feeding them, have changed the bird populations. Yet there is no signage to prohibit the feeding of wildlife.
Organization:
Commenter: Poe S Asher **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1520 **Comment Id:** 352981 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There's no evidence that dogs do any damage to wildlife or the environment. While a few anecdotal tales are produced about dogs attacking birds or animals, this is a vanishingly small number compared to the ordinary threats these birds and animals face from natural predators, from habitat loss due to "Native Plant Restoration" or from normal urban risks - glass windows, moving cars, windmills.

Organization:

Commenter: Rupa Bose **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365506 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: the Natural resources objective is to reduce the detrimental effects of dogs on wildlife and natural vegetation. However, throughout the report, I find no evidence that shows that the present policies have produced any particular detrimental effects. There are many hypothetical statements, and plausible observations, but the plain truth is that the overwhelming majority of off-leash dog use in the GGNRA is on beaches or on planted lawn areas, where none of the detrimental effects are even possible.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6178 **Comment Id:** 365758 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Further, to the extent that many of these complaints are related to incidents where "birds took flight" (as seems to be the case for most of the incident reports selected for inclusion in the report), I think we're over-reacting a bit. I see birds take flight all the time, and generally don't regard these incidents as crimes against nature. If one incident each day of birds taking flight is caused by a dog, out of thousands of such incidents every day in the GGNRA, I think we should all find something else to worry about, even is there is one bird lover out there that finds these events unacceptable.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368439 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Although the section on disturbance to wildlife has been improved since the initial EIS draft, something is missing. Although some relevant literature is discussed regarding disturbance, there is little discussion on the actual disturbance that is occurring at GGNRA that can be observed on a daily basis. A reader of the SEIS who had not observed disturbance by off-leash dogs at GGNRA might not realize the seriousness of the disturbance actually occurring. GGNRA scientific staff have decades of experience observing this disturbance, yet the only

actual instances of disturbance mentioned are from law enforcement incident reports, which are random and non-systematic observations that only occur because of a violation documented by law enforcement staff, not scientific professionals. Observations from scientific staff would be much more useful.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368794 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog-Wildlife Disease Transmission 13. SEIS, pages 382-3, relying primarily on Sime 1999, argues that dogs in the GGNRA will spread diseases to wildlife in the GGNRA. As usual, Sime is an unreliable source. Her studies do not show disease transmission from pet dogs to wildlife. Further, although SEIS presents evidence that there is rabies in northern California, especially among bats, there is no evidence that the rabies comes from pet dogs. In fact, dogs are more likely the victims of transmission of rabies or distemper from wild animals. In this case, it is simply a pet owners responsibility to vaccinate pets against these diseases to protect the pets. No GGNRA pet policy is going to affect disease prevalence among wild animals in the Bay Area.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. While some commenters supported the preferred alternative of the SEIS for the protection of wildlife, other commenters requested that more stringent alternatives or changes be chosen to negate the impacts from dogs on wildlife.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 96 **Comment Id:** 339929 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I fully support the draft dog management plan. I appreciate the Park Service's efforts to safeguard natural areas and wildlife as well as to balance the needs of various constituencies in order to provide safe and equitable access to areas loved by hikers, walkers, birders, and dog-owners<redacted>the young and old, those who are able-bodied, and those with disabilities. The process has been fair and thorough. The Park Service has been charged with protecting our resources and must do so. Thanks for your vigilance.

Organization:

Commenter: Cindy S Shaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 317 **Comment Id:** 350572 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a dog and horse owner and lifetime Bay Area resident, I support a strictly enforced version of the Dog Management Plan. Environmental issues are important, and dogs by their nature and through no fault of their own are invasive and can be disruptive to local wildlife and fauna. That should be obvious to all parties. Other places besides the most pristine areas of

our State should be identified where these wonderful animals can roam and play, which are not as destructive to sensitive natural habitat.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 755 **Comment Id:** 353128 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to see more protection given to bird nesting areas, restricting off lease dogs from these areas,and also stronger enforcement and penalties for letting dogs roam free. Nesting birds are disturbed, wasting precious energy. Often birds are killed by the dogs - Golden Gate Audubon has reported numerous cases of this, but no penalties have been enforced. Endangered Snowy Plovers are particularly at risk but even common gulls and baby geese and ducklings are frequently killed.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Diane B Rooney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 837 **Comment Id:** 353397 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We need better cooperation from dog owners. We all love dogs but when they go after birds at the beach it's just not right. I have never been to Ocean Beach without seeing that happen. Maybe dogs should be completely restricted if their owners can't control them. The dog owners who think it's ok for their dogs to chase birds and other wildlife, the people who are sentimental about their animals can't be allowed to take over. Birds are beautiful too.

Organization:

Commenter: Ruth Zimmerman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3349 **Comment Id:** 358213 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Allowing dogs to run off leash in National Parks or any park where wildlife exists, is inappropriate and endangers the health and safety of said wildlife. Two burrowing owls have been killed at Cesar Chavez State park in Berkeley. The irony is that habitat has been provided within the park for the owls to nest... only to have them lose their lives to off lease dogs. The bottom line is that all dogs should be on lease at all times. The only exception for this would be in enclosed areas where wildlife and other people are not prone to disturbances of any kind.

Organization:

Commenter: Diane Bahr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4043 **Comment Id:** 360322 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a biologist, I feel that a less-restrictive dog use policy in areas like the

National Parks is a dangerous precedent. These areas are meant to be wildlife havens as well as accessible by human visitors, so it stands to reason that allowing the presence of dogs should only be allowed in limited cases. While human use can be a problem as well, dogs that are off-leash can frighten and injure wildlife much more effectively, as a result of their hunting instinct, than most human visitors can or are likely to do.

Organization:

Commenter: Kerry Wilcox **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5631 **Comment Id:** 364035 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We are fully aware of the potential for adverse effects of large numbers of dogs caused by trampling vegetation, depositing dog waste, and adding nutrients. Such degradation of high quality habitat can result in displacing wildlife from preferred habitats, with eventual loss of species from the area. For each of the seven sites in Marin, the Draft SEIS identifies sensitive species, habitats, and/or cultural resources that may be threatened by dogs and has recommended an appropriate response. Therefore, where a choice must be made between allowing dog access and protecting native wildlife, endangered species or sensitive vegetation, the Draft SEIS tips the balance toward protecting the resource.

Organization: Marin Conservation League

Commenter: Jon Elam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5962 **Comment Id:** 364819 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am both a bird lover and a dog person. I am writing to say that after thinking about this from both sides, I fully support the plans for limiting access to important natural areas to dogs off leash. When we think about how little open space in San Francisco actually offers shelter to the few wild species of bird, plant and animal that call this home, I am happy to put my dog on a leash. There are enough options for off leash dog play in the new plan.

Organization: Audubon

Commenter: Sharon M Beals **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6638 **Comment Id:** 367565 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The entire process has been so disheartening that I almost decided to forgo this last ditch comment period because it's increasingly clear that support for pets has continued to relentlessly gnaw away at any semblance of wildlife protection in the GGNRA. There's no question that Mike Lynes' statement is absolutely accurate ' wildlife continues to be pushed aside by the alarmingly boisterous and well-organized dog booster groups, as well as most politicians and newspaper publishers who all seem to confuse affection for pets with concern for wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: M. B Grosjean **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA161092

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 28 **Comment Id:** 337988 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support Alternative D; it provides the most protection for the resource and keeps the dogs out as much as possible. Dogs cause problems for wildlife and for other users. I am tired of being approached by out of control dogs in the GGNRA; they are not in control and should at least be on lease.

Organization: Sierra Club

Commenter: Alan Carlton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 44 **Comment Id:** 338013 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am concerned about the resource degradation associated with the dogs in Chrissy field, especially on East Beach and Central Beach. Why is our national park just a dog walking area, when there are so many other animals, like shorebirds, migrating birds, and other birds, as well as humans, that should benefit from this resource? If you walk on the Central beach during the week, there are often 40 dogs at one time walking the beach with dog walkers. It is a travesty that the dogs are allowed to overrun the beach, destroying the atmosphere for the people there.

Organization:

Commenter: S. O. **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 338955 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support the preferred alternative. I strongly believe that to protect our native species, we need to have only very limited areas where dogs can be off leash. I have witnessed dogs harassing wildlife in GGNRA areas while owners either futilely call after them, or sometimes encourage them, to chase birds and other animals.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 101 **Comment Id:** 339937 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Domesticated invasive animals pose a threat to the natural atmosphere, and the flora and fauna that have been manicured and have naturally sprung up out of Golden Gate Park since its inception.

Organization:

Commenter: Hale N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 20 **Comment Id:** 344086 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a dog owner and I am furious with this recommendation. We have been walking our dogs (who are well behaved and under voice control) for nearly 20 years (2 sets of dogs)on the East end of Crissy Field - off leash. There is a precedent here and that needs to be taken into consideration. Plus, the East End of the beach will disturb wildlife LESS than the middle section. . .it's next to a parking lot, for heaven's sake.

Organization:

Commenter: David Landis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 32 **Comment Id:** 344089 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Of greatest concern to me are the needs of the wildlife that depend on beach areas for nesting, feeding, mating, and etc. As long as Alternative F is effective in providing such protection, I would accept it as the best alternative.

Organization:

Commenter: LeeAnn Bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 119 **Comment Id:** 345837 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: For the sake of birds, other wildlife, vegetation, and all those people who enjoy the beauty of the park in as natural a condition as possible, my family strongly supports the most dog-restrictive of the proposed alternatives. The San Francisco dog epidemic has already greatly diminished the presence of the shorebirds we have loved over the decades at Baker Beach, along Crissy Field, and in other parts of the park. Please strengthen protections within the park from the unnatural and entirely unwelcome disturbances of dogs, particularly those off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: David Jesson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 346269 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We all come at this issue as animal lovers. However, domestic animals have the advantages of readily available food and shelter that wild animals do not. If we respect all animals, we need to protect wild animals even if it is inconvenient to dog owners. This is NOT a civil liberties issue - no-one has a right to destroy ecosystems whether using a bulldozer or walking their dog. This is NOT an issue that can be resolved by increased personal responsibility. A system based on personal responsibility has resulted in the state of affairs we see currently - endangered animals harassed, fragile ecosystems endangered. Personal responsibility is not enough to protect our wild resources. There is simply no way we can protect wild animals and ecosystems without requiring dog owners to be fully responsible for their animals.

Organization:

Commenter: A Sojourner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 140 **Comment Id:** 346301 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am an avid walker and naturalist, and believe that for the protection of wildlife, dogs and wildlife should be separated. I would like to see enclosed areas for dogs; otherwise, dogs strictly on leash, and no dogs at all in sensitive areas where there are ground-nesting birds.

Organization:

Commenter: Libby Ingalls **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 152 **Comment Id:** 347145 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a birdwatcher and lover of wildlife, I am dismayed at the lack of space and protection the management now gives to birds and wildlife, and to the lack of commitment to preserve these creatures and their habitat for future generations. Chrissy Field is the worst. It is in effect an off-leash dog park. I no longer go there to birdwatch. But Ocean Beach, Sutro Heights and Lands End are also significant critical areas for wild creatures and plants, and dogs should not be in these areas on or off-leash (except in a fenced-in area).

Organization:

Commenter: Maggie McElroy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 349887 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We favor maximum restrictions on where dogs are allowed. Their effect on wildlife and flora can't be positive.

Organization: Evogeneao

Commenter: Len Eisenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 158 **Comment Id:** 349900 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The protection and preservation of wildlife must take the highest priority. This is in line with the GGNRA mission: to "preserve and enhance the natural, historic and scenic resources". This is what makes the GGNRA different from a City park.

Organization:

Commenter: Jonathan J Frank **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 192 **Comment Id:** 350076 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I use the fire road on a weekly basis and STRONGLY BELIEVE THE DOGS NEED TO BE ON LEASH OR BANNED ALTOGETHER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: Dog walkers routinely walk 4 dogs who are rarely on leash. I see these dogs run wild disturbing hikers, families, bike riders, local wildlife (Rabbits,birds, etc.), digging/crush

native vegetation, and defecating on the trail.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 193 **Comment Id:** 350082 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Our family support owners keeping thier dogs on leashes on Ocean Beach, with more resources provided for consistent enforcement However, since many dog owners consistently flaunt this requirement, unfortunately, there may need to be an outright ban on dogs in this area. I have seen unleashed dogs on ocean beach repeatedly attack pelicans and other seabirds, to the point of thier deaths, so this is not just a theoretical concern. Our family lives 400 yards from the dunes, and often walk on the beach, typically on a daily basis. While some dog owners are responsible, others see the wildlife on the beach as something to entertain their dogs. I've regularly seen dogs encouraged by thier owners to chase flocks of shore birds attempting o feed and rest by the shore. They have a particularly unfortunate habit of separating a small shore bird from a flock, and chasing it to exhaustion. While dog owners in a city would prefer to have thier pets run unfettered in this area, the interests of the shore birds should also be taken into consideration, especially for the snowy plovers. Some dog owners go as far a video taping this wildlife harassing and attacking activity of thier dogs, apparently to add to the entertainment factor. Interestingly, owners will have thier doges leased on the street, but then purposely take them off leash on the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen McCowin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 256 **Comment Id:** 350368 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have not reviewed all of the draft plan but I do not believe that dogs should be allowed in national and state parks. I think wildlife needs to be protected since humans have encroached on so much of their habitat already. I hike to see wildlife and to feel good knowing that the animals are protected in their environment. Dogs are domesticated animals who still have predator instincts and frighten away wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 262 **Comment Id:** 350378 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog access to GGNP Crissey Field area in general should be very tightly controlled. Wildlife protection should have top priority, as the area is small and heavily used by people.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 265 **Comment Id:** 350382 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Thank you for deciding to require leashes on dogs at Muir Beach. Can't tell you the number of times I have witnessed numerous dogs swimming in Muir Woods Creek as it enters the ocean despite numerous signs telling dog owners to keep their pets out of a very environmentally sensitive area. Dogs disturb the birds and the migrating salmon. A very good decision and a long time coming.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Levine **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 360 **Comment Id:** 351144 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Im stunned that the SEIS makes a dramatic case about habitat destruction and the environmental impact of dogs within these parks, but fails to quantify that their impact is an extremely minor rounding error vs. other factors (including human impact) that are many ordersof- magnitude more significant.

Organization:

Commenter: Glenn Hout **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 426 **Comment Id:** 351351 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If we want to encourage birds to flock to city parks, we should make some areas off-limits to dogs, researchers say. According to a new study in Israel, pooches can lower the diversity of bird species in urban gardens." "To minimize this effect we recommend creating areas in gardens that will be inaccessible to people and dogs," the authors write in Landscape and Urban Planning.

Organization:

Commenter: lin ru **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 440 **Comment Id:** 351373 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The natural resources in the GGNRA are systematically being destroyed by dog owners dog walkers activity likes pensilulity. Dogs chasing wildlife - i.e., birds persons, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: Diane Filbert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1068 **Comment Id:** 351519 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am concerned that our Parks are not allowing enough rest time for the wild animals. The snowy plover and other birds are harassed by even good dogs. There should be more clear separation of areas for wildlife, people without dogs and the off leash areas.

Organization:
Commenter: Chrisitna Braun **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 465 **Comment Id:** 351746 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There also have to be some rules about where dogs have to be on a leash, and about where they can't go; to protect wildlife.
Organization:
Commenter: Paul H Tieck **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 524 **Comment Id:** 351865 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Keep dogs on-leash in wildlife areas - including Ocean Beach. Dogs that chase birds and other wildlife are endangering a key resource in the GGNRA - a resource the park service is mandated to protect!
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 529 **Comment Id:** 351871 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Ocean Beach is a sanctuary for humans and animals. Unfortunately this is not the case for the birds that over-winter here, as they are constantly being chased by off-leash dogs!!! Some of these species fly thousands of miles and need to rest and feed to be able to fly back to their breeding grounds. Instead, they are under constant stress, from dogs. Please restrict off-leash dog "walking" on Ocean Beach. Keep it a sanctuary for all! - Surfer/Beach-goer & San Francisco Native
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 541 **Comment Id:** 351891 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: But in reality the shorebird population in SF is declining. Dogs have alternatives. Birds don't. The 5% is the part great for wildlife (but for dogs & other disturbances)
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1207 **Comment Id:** 351982 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs and their owners can enjoy the parts of the area where they are allowed on leash. This will limit the significant negative impact on sensitive habitat, wild animals and

birds as well as other visitors of all ages.

Organization:

Commenter: David Riedel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1216 **Comment Id:** 352006 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I support the Park Service's efforts to manage the impact of dogs on our natural resources so that their negative impact on birds and wildlife are minimized. There are significantly more dogs and people than there were in 1979, and therefore more pressure on the environment and more negative impact.

Organization:

Commenter: Desi Perim **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1245 **Comment Id:** 352057 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I worry about the environmental impact of poop on the trails and how those dogs affect other wildlife and plants in the area.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Evans **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 578 **Comment Id:** 352665 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I disagree with changing the regulations to prohibit off-leash dogs from Muir Beach for the following reasons: 1) Although protection of the beach environment is important, there is little evidence that off-leash dogs in this very small area of beach have a significant adverse impact on the population of sea-birds and marine life in the GGNRA in general.

Organization:

Commenter: TIMOTHY M SOWERBY **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 587 **Comment Id:** 352678 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs impact others in numerous ways. First, one is far less likely to observe wildlife when a dog is present. I have seen bobcats, coyotes, owls, etc. in many of these areas and I certainly notice the lack thereof when I am with a dog. Numerous times I have witnessed dogs chasing wild animals (e.g., rabbits, birds). The dogs' good-natured play could be trampling nests and/or young and the dogs' presence can deter wild animals from foraging for food.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine E Fowler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 608 **Comment Id:** 352716 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I would like to see "no dogs" in fragile areas, such as beaches and wildlife nesting areas, and restored planting areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Bette-B Bauer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 609 **Comment Id:** 352718 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There are still significant ways in which the new rules fall short of protecting wildlife: ï¿½ They do not require fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas. ï¿½ They allow commercial dog walking with permits, for up to six dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 614 **Comment Id:** 352730 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The very things that dogs love to do (run, play, chase, pounce, attack, dig, jump, defecate, etc.) are the same things that decimate sensitive wildlife populations, injure or kill a whole array of species (sensitive or not), threaten personal space and safety (particularly for seniors and children), and produce pollution and litter issues for people.
Organization:
Commenter: Juliet A Lamont **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 614 **Comment Id:** 352732 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: However, there are still significant ways in which the new rules fall short of protecting wildlife: * They do not require fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas. * They allow commercial dog walking with permits, for up to six dogs. * They dont set numerical compliance goals. The first draft of the EIS required a fixed percentage (such as 75%) og owners to comply with the rules, or tougher regulatory measures would automatically kick in. We are concerned that without fixed compliance targets, the new rules will not be enforced.
Organization:
Commenter: Juliet A Lamont **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 644 **Comment Id:** 352803 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly support the proposed changes with respect to dog restrictions in the GGNRA Dog Management Plan. While I love dogs, and have had them as pets in the past, I think it's essential to protect the little wildlife we still have in the Bay Area from being harassed or killed by dogs off-leash.
Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1459 **Comment Id:** 352814 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This part of the beach has virtually ZERO wildlife that needs to be protected from dogs... saying that some bird "might" be scared by dogs is just a lie.
Organization:
Commenter: Harrison Westwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 700 **Comment Id:** 352957 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is very important that the Dog Management Plan be adopted and implemented to protect the park's resources. Off leash dogs unmanaged in the park cause great destruction to fragile environment and also degrade the condition and quality of the park's trails and amenities for all other users.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 741 **Comment Id:** 353078 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan does not cover nesting areas and sensitive habitat for birds. There should be fences to control off leash dogs from running thru. Also, the dog's raw sewage that many don't pick up are a threat to wildlife and children who play in the sand.
Organization:
Commenter: lida rud **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 774 **Comment Id:** 353265 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Also the GGNRA is a prime birding location and there are many people who enjoy birding for a hobby. This is difficult to do if there are dogs everywhere chasing the birds and other wildlife away. Lastly there are areas of the GGNRA which need to have restricted use for wildlife protection, such as nesting areas for sensitive birds and dogs need to be banned from such areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Betlach **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 780 **Comment Id:** 353273 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly urge the NPS to protect birds in Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The birds are threatened by so many parts of our daily lives. Dogs do not face these threats

and are prolific in the Bay Area, especially San Francisco. The dog regulations will provide bird habitat, prevent bird deaths, and encourage use of GGNRA by families with small children and visitors seeking a peaceful environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Jillian R O'Brien **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 797 **Comment Id:** 353305 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I want to ask you to enforce the rules on dogs in the GGNRA. The birds were there first. And more importantly they need our protection in order to survive.

Organization:

Commenter: amanda f wallace **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 813 **Comment Id:** 353350 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The NPS has just completed a wonderful multi-million dollar refurbishment project at Muir Beach. Wonderful and congratulations. I am writing to encourage the NPS to require that dogs be on-leash only at this beach. My main concern involves dogs (I've counted up to a dozen at a time) playing and swimming in the pond that empties Muir Creek into the Pacific Ocean. This is the creek that runs through Muir Woods and is vital to the survival of the annual salmon run. Despite posted signs requiring owners to keep their dogs out of that area, far too many dog owners ignore the signs to the peril of the salmon, birds and other wildlife for whom this critical area means their survival. Please require dogs on-leash at Muir Beach!!

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Levine **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 884 **Comment Id:** 353588 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The wildlife and native plant life habitat has not been impacted so much by dogs but by people.

Organization:

Commenter: Helen L Norris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3917 **Comment Id:** 353604 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: If the goal is to bring back wildlife than realistically you would have to close the beach completely as wildlife and people do not co-exist.

Organization:

Commenter: Noah Evans **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1701 **Comment Id:** 353658 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is not reason at all to let dogs run wild at GGNRA. There are too many instances when the dogs disturb wildlife. Give the dogs an area to run, but it can be much smaller than it is now. Things change and you now know how much the damage the dogs are doing to birds. The dogs owners just don't want or care to know.

Organization:

Commenter: Jo Ann Herr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1719 **Comment Id:** 353689 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I understand the need to protect wildlife and, especially as a wildlife rehabilitator, I understand the need to reduce threats to wildlife. But very few dogs pose threats to wildlife. Let's get real here - the biggest threat to wildlife is humans

Organization:

Commenter: Mara R Guccione **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1750 **Comment Id:** 353734 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And having had a free roaming dog as a child in a small town, I understand the need for dogs to have a place to run free. However, the GGNRA is not a huge place and is home to wild species for whom the presence of dogs is a threat. These animals must be protected and keeping dogs out of their environment will help do that. There are many places in this city that are dog friendly, we need not sacrifice the open spaces of the GGNRA to their needs while ignoring the real threat to wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: William W Atkins **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1839 **Comment Id:** 354333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This is not to detract from the negative effect that dogs have on wildlife and the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1844 **Comment Id:** 354340 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Moreover, the Audubon Society grossly distorts this discussion by claiming [as their representative did on January 30 in San Francisco at Stern Grove] that dogs are to blame for the reduction in numbers of certain birds. No empirical data supports that false claim - the Audubon representative couldn't cite any when asked to do so on January 30. Feral cats, coyotes

and other natural predators ignored by this plan are more of a risk to birds than dogs. And they all have been such a risk since time immemorial and before there ever was a national park system.

Organization:

Commenter: David Collins **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1927 **Comment Id:** 354565 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a wildlife biologist, I support the specific changes in this Draft dog management plan; specifically the changes that protect wildlife in specific areas from the disruptions caused by dogs. Dogs and people are great but neither species belongs everywhere.

Organization:

Commenter: Sally de Becker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1959 **Comment Id:** 354617 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The benefit to the Bay Area's natural plant/animal life by restricting dogs to leashes in these spaces seems very suspect to me considering the fact that these spaces represent a small percentage of the natural land of the Bay area, and that they are spaces already altered by the humans and human infrastructure that surround them.

Organization:

Commenter: Sabrina Barry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2027 **Comment Id:** 354699 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The frequency of dog activity in our native wildlife habitats is putting several species at risk. Hawks need to eat, Owls need to eat, birds need to nest, plants need certain nutrients to grow. All native plants and animals are important to our ecosystem. They have adapted to live here, and should NOT be forced out or threatened by the behavior of dogs, or lack of enforcement by our park system which they rely on for protection. An owner can only do so much to control a dog's natural instinct to run, chase, hunt, sniff, etc. And they shouldn't have to. This is why it is necessary to have designated, fenced in, areas so dogs can express those instincts.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2151 **Comment Id:** 355802 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The policy of further restriction, especially if it is as severe as proposed, could well have catastrophic consequences for bird and wildlife populations in other parts of the park.

Organization: individual

Commenter: John M Stiggelbout **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2166 **Comment Id:** 356085 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As such, dogs have a vastly more stressful impact on the wildlife that naturally resides (or tries to reside) in the areas under consideration. Even human children, who are presumably in training by their adult mentors to act like 'civilized human beings', are not as stressful to wildlife as even the most well-trained Fido. Dogs DO NOT BELONG in these areas.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2194 **Comment Id:** 356737 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Restrictions must absolutely be put in place to preserve our wildlife. They were here first, and they are the ones who are endangered ... not the domestic dog (who is of course a lovely companion, when properly trained ... and cleaned up after!)
Organization:
Commenter: Marie McNulty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2210 **Comment Id:** 356797 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I write in support of the proposed new rules and stricter policies for dogs in the GGNRA. GGNRA is the only national park that allows unleashed dogs, which has a negative impact on wildlife, plant life, and other patrons in the park. I say this as a dog owner and someone who has worked and volunteered in animals shelters for many years. But I am also a birder, and an environmentalist, and I don't believe that the narrow interests of dog owners should be allowed to trump all other considerations.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephanie L Strait **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2773 **Comment Id:** 357433 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I also would like to add that I believe there is no evidence to suggest that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any substantial negative impacts. We and almost all other dog owners I know are very conscientious of our impact on the environment. We pick up after our dog and we do not allow him to chase the wildlife, dig holes, or otherwise cause disturbances.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Ruch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2866 **Comment Id:** 357687 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If people aren't able to re-create in the City, then they'll be forced into more rural areas which will have greater impacts on wildlife.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrew J Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357940 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: "Wildlife (other than special status species): The only impacts listed are in the section on wildlife in coastal communities. The impacts are similar to snowy plover impacts, although no other species are threatened or endangered. Similar to the snowy plover, there was no information provided to indicate harm to birds or more impact than from humans in the SSPA.
Organization:
Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3321 **Comment Id:** 358145 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Even though Alternative F prohibits dogs in the wildlife protection area it allows dogs, in some cases totally off leash, into areas adjacent to, and used by resident, migrating and vagrant birds. It also allows dogs onto beach areas where the potential for future interaction with marine mammals is high. ROLAs in the airfield area are too close to protected areas, and the airfield has already hosted a number of migrant and rare vagrant bird species that would be impacted by the numbers of dogs and owners drawn to designated ROLAs in that area. I would urge you to consider more restrictions on dogs at Crissy Field including the elimination of ROLAs along the main airfield.
Organization:
Commenter: Mark Butler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3341 **Comment Id:** 358186 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We are familiar with the numerous examples of dogs flushing wildlife within GGNRA. There are multiple studies proving that bird stress hormones levels rise even when birds do not run or fly away from the stress-provoking situations. In other words, the impact on wildlife by large concentrations of dogs is likely even greater than we realize. As a wildlife biologist and birdwatcher, being able to observe wildlife is one of the richest experiences our national park lands offer. Over the years, I would estimate that 50% o my wildlife watching in NPS lands open to dog walking are cut short because canines have flushed the wildlife I am trying to observe and enjoy.
Organization:
Commenter: Emilie N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3383 **Comment Id:** 358296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Us humans harm the environment way more than dogs. If you think that dogs would harm the birds, they won't, because last time I checked, birds can fly. I have never seen a dog catch a bird, so I don't think thats the problem.
Organization:
Commenter: Jackson N Fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3401 **Comment Id:** 358328 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Unleashed dogs threaten birds and other wildlife. Restraint should be at the strictest standards of the NPS so that all wildlife, plants as well as animals, have as much protection as possible.
Organization:
Commenter: Lewis Ellingham **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2385 **Comment Id:** 358861 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Not a single resident plant or animal benefits from the presence of dogs in the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Patrick Skain **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2429 **Comment Id:** 358928 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly support limiting dog spaces and off leash dogs in the parks. Wildlife and plants need space and a chance to live and flourish. Please do limit the dogs! I have seen them chasing wildlife and birds constantly ever since I have lived in San Francisco (20 years) and have been shocked by the attitude of the owners towards the natural landscape. I see constant degradation of the landscape and the wild life.
Organization:
Commenter: Caroline Ayres **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2493 **Comment Id:** 358995 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I support the GGNRA's plan to restrict dog access to vulnerable bird and wildlife nesting and foraging areas. The birds and wildlife have no voice; they just become extinct as their home is trampled and destroyed. I'm sick and tired of irresponsible dog owners who allow their dogs to litter the beaches and trails with dog shit. They ruin the area for

everyone. I hope you do right by the birds and wildlife; their home territories are shrinking. BTW, I own a dog. I don't let her off leash and don't take her to any off leash areas. The one time I did, the place was disgusting. Every couple of feet, I found dog shit among the shrubbery and along the trail. It was truly gross and I left and have never gone back.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2594 **Comment Id:** 359133 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I believe that the parks should provide a safe environment for all of its users. The US Parks are NOT A DOG PARK. Dog feces on beach are a serious health hazard (and disgusting), especially at the beach where children and adults are barefoot. Additionally dogs are a hazard to wild life.

Organization:

Commenter: Henry Gunst **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3927 **Comment Id:** 360023 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: While many dog owners are responsible for their pets, the effect on wildlife from unleashed dogs is undeniable. and it does not take many animals to affect the entire population of wildlife. I have observed on numerous occasions at the waterfront, the effect of just a few dogs pursuing shorebirds, forcing them to use valuable energy to escape.

Organization:

Commenter: jeffrey p haltiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4058 **Comment Id:** 360577 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: All the arguments about protection of wildlife, birds, mammals, etc. included, are profound and must be a first consideration before space is relinquished to domestic dog presence.

Organization: WILLIAM HAMMOND HALL SOCIETY

Commenter: Barton Mayhew **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4645 **Comment Id:** 361175 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As an avid bird-watcher, I support a Dog Management Plan that keeps dogs on leash in and near any sensitive bird habitat- -and that can & will be enforced. Too often I see dog owners letting their dogs run into so-called protected areas, chasing birds. In my experience, placing off-leash areas next to protected or on-leash areas generally doesn't work because it's too tempting for the people or the dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Perry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4684 **Comment Id:** 361323 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The most important reason for dog restrictions in our parks is the need for wildlife to flourish. Endangered birds, native plants, and all sorts of beneficial wildlife require a modicum of freedom from the pressures exerted by dogs. When we require dogs to be on leash in designated areas and absent from others, we will find a greater number of living things enjoying our parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Kimberly jannarone **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4703 **Comment Id:** 361355 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I frequently encounter unrestrained dogs chasing birds in our parks and on our shorelines, and will welcome any and all official efforts to limit and control this problem and its profoundly negative impacts on wildlife, plants, and humans alike.
Organization:
Commenter: Christine Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4785 **Comment Id:** 361526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Of course there are other voices that support a different position than mine, but the "scientific" and real evidence of the impact of dogs in the GGNRA just doesn't hold up. In the 22 years that I have used the GGNRA spaces with my dogs, the wild flora and fauna of the parklands has thrived. WIth proper signage and enforcement by the National Park Service, conflicts can be minimized.
Organization:
Commenter: Laurie Berk **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4787 **Comment Id:** 361528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a wildlife biologists who has studied dog and wildlife behavior for years, there are simply no credible peer-reviewed studies documenting that dogs have a negative impact on wildlife in the area.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4792 **Comment Id:** 361545 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA report cites things that dogs COULD do to cause damage. Where is the evidence? What about the bountiful coyotes on this land? These wild animals COULD pose a much greater danger that our coddled pups. Are you going to remove them too?

Organization: MDG

Commenter: Margaret P Kritzer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4808 **Comment Id:** 361573 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The second large problem with allowing domesticated dogs to roam free concerns the unfortunate ability of the dog to drop a load of waste at almost any given moment. These dropping (feces) carry nasty pathogen and viruses that can be transmitted to wildlife and humans simply by coming in contact with the dropping. It matters little if the droppings are 'picked up' or not. The residue does remain and presents the possibility of human or wildlife contact.

Organization: Audubon Society-Marin County

Commenter: Richard A Fraites **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4845 **Comment Id:** 361625 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I support more land for wildlife as this is an important part of the National Park Service's mission. Dogs in San Francisco do have other options, but wildlife does not in the fringes of the urban San Francisco area.

Organization:

Commenter: Victoria E Langenheim **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4883 **Comment Id:** 361700 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In twenty years of running on Crissy Field, I once, and only once, saw a dog chase a bird on the meadow. The dog was a puppy who did not know any better, and the bird simply flew away. Dogs are not predators like feral cats. The assertion that the off-leash dogs at Crissy Field endanger wildlife is unsupported by evidence and absurd on its face. I fully support the extensive fencing of sensitive areas to protect landscape and wildlife, including the Snowy Plover nesting area from humans and dogs, but the current policy of allowing off-leash dog walking cannot be shown to have any impact on the well-being of the avian population of Crissy Field.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard Springwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5001 **Comment Id:** 361909 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We do not need a lot of dogs running around on or off leash to harass the flora

and fauna and leave their excrement around which could spread disease.

Organization:

Commenter: Edward Nute **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4217 **Comment Id:** 362221 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please get dogs off the beach and let the shorebirds breed in safety- -dog and beach lover

Organization: retired USAID

Commenter: sharon a Fee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5153 **Comment Id:** 362289 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog owners complain that there are not enough places to let their dogs run, but there are plants and animals, some of them endangered, that don't have ANYWHERE else to go. They should have priority. I support your proposal with the caviot that off leash dog areas should be enclosed in some way..

Organization:

Commenter: Linda M Morgan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5227 **Comment Id:** 362714 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Over the 2008-2011 period, the NPS recorded a total of three incidents of dogs damaging vegetation and fifteen incidents of dogs disturbing wildlife. These numbers are recorded in a period of over 40,000,000 visitors to the GGNRA, again hardly indicative of an issue.

Organization:

Commenter: David Nielsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5268 **Comment Id:** 362839 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The 'research' the GGNRA has gathered erroneously implies that removing dogs from these areas will remove the threat to fragile restored wildlife populations. Unless the GGNRA plans to also ban children, adults, hang-gliders, hawks and radio-controlled planes, then this line of though is seriously flawed.

Organization:

Commenter: Caroleen Beatty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5265 **Comment Id:** 362844 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I understand that humans are often very emotionally attached to their pets, but the reality is that dogs are predators and many do chase and harm wildlife. Yes, they are damaging to ecosystems. (And please pick up the poo!! It's so rude to leave it, particularly in high density urban areas.)

Organization:

Commenter: deidre martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5392 **Comment Id:** 363044 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is a difficult question, but I do feel the wildlife that co-inhabits our open spaces is harmed by a daily onslaught of overwrought dogs.....thus, a policy protecting indigenous wildlife is necessary.

Organization:

Commenter: Natasha Gubert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5415 **Comment Id:** 363178 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. San Francisco is a relatively small urban area that hosts dozens of endemic and/or endangered species. Many users - including myself - come to these areas to learn about and see the nature enclosed in the parks. Many of the park segments contain critical patches of habitat for endangered species and other nature. The presence of dogs in many of these areas can be disturbing to wildlife, and should be restricted in some. Please make sure that the most critical wildlife areas are designated as off limits to dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: JOHN P Dumbacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5423 **Comment Id:** 363199 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: i support restricting access for dogs to our parklands. there is no other way to safely protect wildlife & natural features. i love dogs. but they are domesticated, urban creatures. they will (by their nature) chase & harass wildlife & heavily impact the environment. dog owner are rabid abt their defense of free access. however, from an environmental & democratic standpoint, free- access is not fair.

Organization:

Commenter: elliot helman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5545 **Comment Id:** 363919 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no scientific evidence to what you are claiming- -I've reviewed it with several of my fellow birder friends, some of whom are not dog owners, as well as an

environmental scientist. I'm at that beach and field multiple times a week, and I have only once seen someone let their dog into the bird sanctuary, and I promptly called park police to handle it.

Organization:

Commenter: Melinda Byerley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5631 **Comment Id:** 364038 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: MCL also agrees with Alternative F's general approach to trails in the Marin Headlands, which is to allow on-leash dog access on the perimeter of the area, while protecting the integrity of wild inner portions frequented by coyote, bobcat, and other wildlife with large territories and need of protections. This approach safety also enhances visitor safety.

Organization: Marin Conservation League

Commenter: Jon Elam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5663 **Comment Id:** 364092 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Respectfully, I think dogs should be on leashes in ALL NPS areas. Banning them from some areas within NPS properties would be a good idea, too. Specifically, I think they should be banned from ALL beaches due to potential negative impacts upon Western Snow Plover.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel Edelstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5775 **Comment Id:** 364278 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I fully support on-leash areas for dog owners to walk their pets, while not letting them trample through sensitive habitat. If off-leash areas will exist, perhaps they could be fenced in or surrounded by bushes or other more natural materials. Seeing the damage that has been done on beaches by hundreds of irresponsible dog owners is upsetting, and I know that many species of birds and mammals have been driven out of these habitats due to off-leash dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura Wilkinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5792 **Comment Id:** 364309 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGNRA has threatened or endangered species for you to protect along its beaches. These animals and plants have no spokesperson to defend their needs. So NSAS feels there should be NO area in the National Park that dogs should be allowed to go off leash to protect them, people, and some other dogs themselves. We are sorry to take such a tough stance on this, but wildlife, especially those rare and endangered species as stated above are in your charter to protect. Dogs and cats have an excellent sense of smell and can find and disturb

nesting birds and loafing animals. So do those animals. If they get a whiff that there are predators, they will not use that habitat.

Organization: Napa-Solano Audubon Society

Commenter: Robin L Leong **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5793 **Comment Id:** 364314 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a CA Species of Special Concern, the NPS is will within its authority and is, frankly, duty-bound to afford the highest possible protection for the plovers. Not only will the plovers benefit from strictly limiting access for dogs, rare plants, amphibians, and microhabitats well benefit, too.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5938 **Comment Id:** 364676 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I would like to voice my support of restrictions on off leash dogs in the GGNRA. Habitat degradation, the stressing of wild life, the trampling of restored areas and numerous incidents of having off leash dogs jumping on or barking at me has curtailed my enjoyment of this national park.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert M Cullison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5940 **Comment Id:** 364685 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: So far, I have not seen any scientific evidence produced by the NPS supporting the fact that dogs are detrimental to the wildlife in the area. There is no basis for such drastic restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Denise M Lamott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5963 **Comment Id:** 364820 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I support all forms of stronger control of dogs. Dogs interfere with wildlife in all parks, and interfere with me when I picnic, bicycle, and jog. Dogs owners delegation of walking to professionals makes bicycling difficult. I am often confronted with a trail full of unleashed dogs, left right and center. I am concerned about the effect of dogs on wildlife, such as bobcats and birds.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6084 **Comment Id:** 365380 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs do not belong in public parks. Perhaps in some urban settings where there are paths, dogs could be allowed on leash. However, for most areas where there are trails through nature areas, dogs are non-native species that upset the natural wildlife. From an environmental standpoint, dogs belong in their own yards, not on public lands. Dogs by their nature harass other wildlife, especially when off-leash, so this is in direct contradiction to the premise of a park where people can enjoy a natural setting.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Malbon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4487 **Comment Id:** 365388 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This new dog plan for Rancho Coral de Tierra will very negatively affect my dog and I. I have grown up in Montara and I have been using Rancho for walking my dog many years here. In reading over this document I have found it very unconvincing. There is little to no evidence of dogs destroying or hurting the vegetation or wildlife in Rancho Corral de Tierra. If I am to accept that claim that off-leash dog walking is causing damage then I need scientific proof. If you can reference any hard evidence of the ecological impact then please let me know.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeremy A MacKinnon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6115 **Comment Id:** 365454 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I like to see the bobcats, coyotes, rabbits, squirrels on the public property / NPS land. Research clearly shows that there are less critters around when dogs are present - bc they scare them off!

Organization:

Commenter: Matt Richardson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365534 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: MAS continues to support Alternative D because it would provide more comprehensive and effective protections for the natural resources within the boundaries of GGNRA. It is clear to us, after reviewing the record, that protecting wildlife and habitat is the primary reason the NPS has restricted dogs use on Marin trails. MAS supports this criterion for guiding decisions. In our view, however, adequate protection will not be achieved because the proposed restrictions are not adequate, enforcement is unclear and compliance is far from certain. The Plan is weighted in favor of dogs and dog walkers and does not go far enough to protect habitat. The DSEIS proposes to allow dogs on every Marin area and, since the DEIS, dog use has been expanded on a number of Marin sites, including Muir Beach, and Rodeo Beach.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society
Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366013 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: First, dog-related recreation clearly has significant impacts on wildlife. The overwhelming body of scientific literature-much of it cited in the SEIS-demonstrates that dog-related recreation has a strong negative impact on wildlife and habitat. Empirically, GGAS members have observed these impacts as local, native species such as the California Quail and brush rabbits have been extirpated by dog-related recreation at Ft. Funston; elsewhere, our members have recorded and observed dogs actively harassing and sometimes killing birds within the GGNRA.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6391 **Comment Id:** 366056 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS fails to note that there is conflicting scientific evidence about the impacts of dogs on birds and vegetation. There is no scientific consensus that restrictions on off-leash dogs are needed to protect wildlife and vegetation. Forrest and Cassidy St. Clair (2006) and Warren (2007) show that there is little to no impact of off-leash dogs on bird diversity, abundance and feeding. The SEIS needs to test the hypothesis that off-leash dogs are harmful to these sites before it can justify further restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeffrey A Ubersax **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6217 **Comment Id:** 366134 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: A worthy undertaking, to try to manage the already excessive population in beaches and parks. They represent, by their numbers, a large and negative impact on plants and birds and non-dog toting humans.
Organization:
Commenter: Rosemary Ranck **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6241 **Comment Id:** 366172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: What I do not believe is that there is legitimate, UNBIASED scientific evidence that offleash areas are threatening wildlife. I would be more concerned with parades, races and generally irresponsible park attendees who leave trash, fires, etc and have no incentive to keep these spaces in tact.
Organization:

Commenter: Christine B Brumback **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366334 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: To adequately protect wildlife, current and potential nesting areas should be off-limits to dogs year-round. Seasonal closures are largely ineffective, even with the best of signage and education campaigns. By permitting dogs near Bank Swallow habitat during any portion of the year, the park will reduce compliance with regulations when the swallows are present, as many people will not realize that the closure is seasonal.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6271 **Comment Id:** 366376 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: At a park presentation, as I am concerned about removing multiple Marin headland trails from on-leash walking, I asked a ranger if there had been any reports of dogs to bobcat or coyote or other wild life interactions and she said "NO". So added to the speculative nature of the above "issue", the GGNRA does not seem to have a valid argument. MORE DATA NEEDS TO BE COLLECTED before changing the dog walking access.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6623 **Comment Id:** 367477 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: With other members of the Montara Dog group, I met with Mr. Ken White at the Peninsula Humane Society to discuss potential environmental impacts of dogs in the Rancho. After consideration with his wildlife experts, they felt that allowing the status quo to remain would not do harm to the environment. Yet, the GGNRA does not have any science to back up its restrictive policy: just possible problems as evidence by choice of language.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Eshman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368126 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Ft. Funston and all other Headlands: This cliff and beach area is more remote and more suited to less disturbing waterfront recreation, it still presents... trampling damage to native plants and chasing of bird life in fields and beaches, - places hikers and equestrian recreation in constant unwelcome and often volatile surprises on trails from dogs allowed to get ahead complacent owners, - expends too much public money to secure safety and rescue from falls off of cliffs - compromises sensitive cliffs from even more rapid erosion. Off Leash dog use must be confined to the most common sense remote areas of Ft. Funston and all other Headlands

regardless of size. All trails whose sides cannot be fenced must be for Dogs On Leashes Only. Enforcement of beach and trail use must be strictly enforced. Map 16-C closes illustrates an acceptable compromise with the EXCEPTION that the inland off-leashes area and next to the parking lot MUST BE REMOVED and allow for dogs to be released ONLY when they get to the beach. More sensitive trails must be removed and ON-leashes until they arrive completely down the trails to the beach is acceptable. Map 16-D is preferred, but it would be hell frozen over to enforce.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The literature reviews for disturbance issues related to shorebirds was initially poor, suggesting that GGNRA staff and EIS authors did not have a good understanding of the basic biology of shorebirds. NPS must realize that allow such a serious impact as offleash dogs into sensitive areas where visitors and resources are put at risk is not a management policy that has been generally allowed. There has been little need to study such a situation, and few specifically relevant studies have been done that address the degree of off-leash activity occurring in GGNRA. Relevant literature searches by non-specialists will often return little information. In order to prepare an adequate EIS, the study authors must have adequate understanding and knowledge of the basic biology and other relevant sciences pertaining to the resources, sociological knowledge of visitors, and knowledge of canine behavior. It will be difficult for Park staff and contractors who are most likely generalists to obtain the required knowledge without consulting with specialists

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368434 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Goss-Custard et al. (2006) have used models to estimate in their study area, the a species of shorebird is disturbed more than between 1.0 and 1 .5 times per hour in good feeding conditions or 0.2 to 0.5 times per hour in poor feeding conditions a reduction in fitness would result.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368441 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As I described in detail in my comments to the initial draft EIS, off-leash dogs frequently chase flocks of shorebirds for great distances along the tide line. This impact is so severe and obvious that there is little relevant scientific literature on a bird populations chronically affected by off-leash dogs to a similar degree, because off-leash dogs are usually

banned in beach environments that have significant shorebird populations. It is not difficult for someone with knowledge of shorebird biology to discuss the degree of the disturbance and the potential impact on shorebirds of the disturbance obseried at Ocean Beach. However, this is not done in the SEIS, probably leaving most readers questioning why it is important to prohibit off-leash activity where sensitive bird populations occur.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6550 **Comment Id:** 368576 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: secure fenced area is where dogs should go to play so that dogs do not have the chance kill, maim, chase, or otherwise harass birds, wildlife and unsuspecting humans. The hard-wired canine instinct is to seek, chase, and kill prey.

Organization:

Commenter: NA NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1444 **Comment Id:** 368772 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As part of our care we respect the wildlife and do not disturb the native flora and fauna. As locals we live with the local wildlife, we keep the deer out of our gardens but let them into our pastures, we enjoy the native predators and hope they don't eat too many of our domestic animals. We (including our dogs) and the native animals find a way to live together. The dogs in Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada have been off leash in the area for decades and there is no evidence of a decline in the number of native animals that can be accredited to the dogs. Perhaps a decline due to the rapid growth of the area but that is human intervention not dogs. I have photos on a home trail cam of some of the local predators; fox, coyote, raccoon etc. I have not been lucky enough to get the mountain lion but know it has been close. The wood rats make nests in our backyard and there are birds of all kinds in the yard. Does leave their fawns at the edge of our property while they browse in our fields. Our loose farm dogs have not kept any away. The DMP/SEIS states that off leash dogs are a threat to the native animals. From my observations of the native fauna I can find no evidence that supports the contention that they need protection from off leash dogs. This is supported by Mr. Ken White, President of the Peninsula Humane Society and his professional staff, who also find no reason to ban off leash dogs. As an ecologist I have been interested for years in the interactions of native fauna and the encroachment of humans. I find these rural interfaces most interesting by the adaptations of the native animals to the new environment. We have a large coyote population in Montara (much more of a threat to other species than the occasional off leash dog) but they are rarely seen and seldom heard. Most dogs are not inclined to hunt; domesticated dogs historically do not do well when left on their own in the wild. They rely on the food provided by their owners and are not apt to try to find another source. If the threat to wildlife is real, there is no scientific evidence in the DMP/SEIS that off leash dogs are a threat. Without scientific evidence there is no reason for the ban and it should be removed.

Organization:

Commenter: Lyndall Erb **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368789 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs and Wildlife 8. SEIS, page 376, cites Miller et al 2001 and Simes 1999, 8.4 to claim that dogs disturb wildlife more than people alone, and that dogs increase a persons radius of disturbance. The SEIS misuses Miller et al 2001 just as the DEIS did. Millers statement about radius of disturbance doesnt come from any evidence he gathered. What his evidence showed, and the point of Millers study was, that dogs disturbed the birds less than people with dogs or people alone. Sime offers absolutely no evidence or citations to support her claim.
Organization:
Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368790 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SEIS, page 377, uses Sime 1999 to say, Injuries sustained may result in death or may compromise the animals ability to carry on other necessary life functions resulting in eventual death. The studies in Rocky Mountain Wildlife which document killed and/or injured animals describe deer that were deliberately run down with trained hunting dogs, and sometimes killed. None were killed or injured by dogs accompanying recreationists. Sime goes way beyond what her colleagues report, (those who actually studied the interactions), offering her evidence-free speculation.
Organization:
Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368791 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SEIS, page 378, uses Sime 1999, 8.10, to say dogs can . . . injure or kill birds. This citation demonstrates why the numerous citations of Sime 1999 in the DEIS and SEIS are simply worthless. They are not scientific evidence of any kind. Sime does say on page 8.10 that dogs can kill or injure birds. But, as usual, Sime provides no evidence to support the claim. In fact, Sime discusses eight (8) specific studies of impacts on birds. Some didnt involve dogs at all. The literature cited by Sime shows no case of a bird injured or killed by a dog. Lets be specific about what Sime says. Here are the studies discussed in Sime 1999, pages 8.10-8.11: a) Hansen and Grant (1991) state that pedestrians generated the most negative responses by birds, but Sime jumps into that same sentence with her speculation that presence of dogs may [emphasis added] intensify bird responses to pedestrians. b) Burger (1986) studied effects of human activity on shorebirds. People walking accounted for 43% ad 50% o disturbances in two bays studied, followed by fishermen, airplanes, and then dogs. c) Hoopes (1993) studied human-related disturbances of piping plovers: pedestrians 86%, (not just dogs) 7%, cles 5%, s 2%. observed chick mortalities were caused by cat, herring gull, human handling, and off-road vehicle-none by dogs. d) Yalden and Yalden (1990) studied nesting golden plovers. Adult plovers spent 11% o the day responding to people. e) Keller (1991) lists dogs as disturbers of eider ducklings (after

fishing and people walking, and not ranked against windsurfing and boating) but doesnt quantify the dogs effect. No mortality or injury reported. f) Baydack (1986) disturbed lekking sharp-tailed grouse with various treatments. Females were displaced by all disturbances, including parked vehicles and snow fencing. Males were flushed only by humans and leashed dogs. He does not compare humans alone to humans with dogs. g) Patterson (1952) found that humans flushed sage grouse on a lek (dogs not involved.) h) Ingold et al. found that nesting ptarmigan in Switzerland slowed their heart rate when approached by a hiker (dogs not involved.) Contrary to Simes and the SEIS citation, in none of the studies were birds injured or killed by dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368792 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SEIS, page 379, uses Andrusiak 2003 to claim, Dogs disturbing foraging birds may diminish a birds foraging time and can result in a loss of energy required to migrate, and can significantly affect their survival during migration. Andrusiak did not say that in Andrusiak 2003. Andrusiak conducted an extensive literature review, looking for effects of dogs on birds. His conclusion was that the statement, Dog disturbance (excluding other sources of disturbance) to overwintering or migrating birds affects their survival and/or reproductive success, is categorized as Unknown/no data. That is to say, Andrusiak found no evidence that dogs affect the survival of birds during migration. It is dishonest of SEIS to pretend that Andrusiak provides scientific support for their claim. (This misuse of Andrusiak was pointed out in comments on the DEIS. GGNRA could have looked at Andrusiaks paper to see they were misusing it. GGNRA either didnt bother to look, or looked and decided to continue with their blatant misrepresention of Andrusiaks paper.)

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6474 **Comment Id:** 368831 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If a dog is allowed off-leash in any open park area, including the GGNRA, the vast majority of dogs will naturally and normally chase wildlife, thereby disturbing the wildlife and the experience of park visitors enjoying the presence of the wildlife. There is no scientific evidence to support the proposition that dogs are not natural predators and will not uniformly chase wildlife if off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Celeste Langille **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6474 **Comment Id:** 368834 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The DEIS documents disturbance of wildlife such as plovers and other birds which are often disturbed by dogs, which they see as natural predators, and disturbance triggers

reactions that can lead to death of these birds. Disturbance of wildlife by dogs has been recorded within the GGNRA and documented in several published studies and reports, many of which are cited in the Draft Dog Management Plan DEIS. Please adopt the alternative(s) that are supported by the studies and experts cited in the SEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Celeste Langille **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6536 **Comment Id:** 368845 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The policy changes will have almost no impact on habitats or wildlife in Ft. Mason, Crissy Field, Ft. Point (as there are really no wildlife or habitats in these areas).

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6561 **Comment Id:** 369505 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I frequently use and enjoy the GGNRA lands and am concerned about impacts from dog-related recreation on wildlife, habitats and other park users.

Organization:

Commenter: Marjorie Blackwell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6585 **Comment Id:** 369583 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Disease is another negative impact that dogs can introduce to wildlife.

Organization: Protecting Earth & Animals with Compassion and Education

Commenter: Randall Cleveland **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6678 **Comment Id:** 369616 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It has become abundantly clear throughout this environmental review process that the presence of dogs in the GGNRA negatively impacts wildlife, including federally protected species. Wild Equity and others have previously submitted substantive comments and provided evidence on the issue, and the Park Service has acknowledged this. Plovers and other birds are often disturbed by dogs, which they see as natural predators, and disturbance triggers reactions that can lead to death of these birds. Disturbance of wildlife by dogs has been recorded within the GGNRA and documented in several published studies and reports. For instance, incident reports show that dogs often chase, and sometimes kill, birds and other wildlife. One incident report states that three different dogs chased shorebirds at Ocean, and in two cases dogs chased the federally protected Snowy Plover(20). At Crissy Field, a ranger witnessed a dog kill a western grebe(21).In another incident at the Mann Headlands, a ranger witnessed a dog chasing a heard of deer in a wildlife protection area(22). These are just a few examples of the problems

that occur for wildlife in the GGNRA. The Park Service has provided no evidence that off-leash dogs respond to voice control, and the difficulty of controlling a dog in the presence of wildlife is insurmountable. To account for this problem, offleash dogs must only be allowed in an area that is fully enclosed, either by a fence or natural boundary.

Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Commenter: Laura Horton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/11/2014)

WQ4000 Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives (Substantive)

1. Commenters noted that dog waste entering creeks and waterways contaminates the water, which violates clean water laws and contaminates drinking water.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 120 **Comment Id:** 345838 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Walking through the trees by Lobos Creek you will find an enormous amount of used dog waste bags left behind, on the ground in the runoff areas for Lobos Creek. 80% o the water that the the residents of the Presidio Park comes from Lobos Creek. Many of theses residents have small children. Even if these people's rent didn't fund a lot of the maintenance on the park, it is unethical and violates clean water laws to contaminate drinking water with dog feces. Many dog walkers - walking several dogs at a time - walk through the park and near Lobos Creek runoff areas. All medications and flea control that these animals receive are leaching into the water when people let the dogs use the area as a personal toilet.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5777 **Comment Id:** 364286 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On countless occasions, owners have let dogs contaminate waterways by not picking up feces; have actively ignored posted signs pertaining to presence of endangered species; and have created situations in which both humans and dogs could be injured. When a dog is off-leash, it is unknown to the general public whether the animal will or will not listen to voice commands or if the animal is in fact of a more peaceful demeanor or not.

Organization: Concerned Citizen

Commenter: Andy Keller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

To: Marin, Chad[chad_marin@nps.gov]
Cc: Savidge, Michael[michael_j_savidge@nps.gov]; Kevin Cochary[kevin_cochary@nps.gov]
From: Lavasseur, Randolph
Sent: Thur 6/26/2014 1:57:36 PM
Importance: Normal
Subject: Re: Draft Dog mgt rule
Received: Thur 6/26/2014 1:57:37 PM

Tuesday is better for me.

On Thursday, June 26, 2014, Marin, Chad <chad_marin@nps.gov> wrote:

I suggest Monday or Tuesday the 7th or 8th at 1300.

On Wed, Jun 25, 2014 at 12:08 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

HI Kevin,
As I am finalizing the dog mgt rule, I want to insure that I am considering any additional specificity that we can add that will help you all in the field to enforce it, as well as insure that maps are accurate in reflecting our common understanding.

Exemption 5

I expect that it will be a 2hr meeting; and, I can arrange additional time to get in the field, if necessary, to review problematic areas and boundaries.

Since we were committed to have this completed by July 3, now July 11, can we schedule in as one of your available meetings? I will make myself available based on your schedules. Sooner the better.

Mike

Exemption 5

--
Chad Marin
Law Enforcement Specialist
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Office: 415-289-3137
Cell: 415-850-4349

Fax: 415-339-9137

--
Randy Lavasseur,
Deputy Chief,
Law Enforcement & Emergency Services
Golden Gate National Recreation Area

507 McReynolds
Sausalito, CA 94965
Office: 415.289.3132

To: Michael Edwards[michael_b_edwards@nps.gov]
From: Savidge, Michael
Sent: Thur 6/26/2014 10:07:49 PM
Importance: Normal
Subject: Fwd: Cancelling: Dog Mgt coord mtg: Friday(6/27/14) from 10-11AM
Received: Thur 6/26/2014 10:07:49 PM

Have not heard back from Shirwin yet. She may be tied up today. So, will try with her tomorrow as well. Meanwhile, can we book the time we usually meet for dog mgt coord mtg? I have addressed the other issues for that time period with respective staff, and can devote the hour to a joint approach to concern statements.
Mike

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Savidge, Michael** <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov>
Date: Thu, Jun 26, 2014 at 1:28 PM
Subject: Re: Cancelling: Dog Mgt coord mtg: Friday(6/27/14) from 10-11AM
To: Michael Edwards <michael_b_edwards@nps.gov>, Alexandra Picavet <alexandra_picavet@nps.gov>, Steven Ortega <steve_ortega@nps.gov>, Kevin Cochary <kevin_cochary@nps.gov>, Frank Dean <frank_dean@nps.gov>, Todd Robertson <todd_robertson@nps.gov>

Given the vacations of some, and the PWR Director's meeting on ROD for GMP for others in the morning, we will not have our standing dog mgt coord mtg. tomorrow, 6/26, unless one of you brings up substantive issue to resolve within next week for the group by end of day today in response to this email.
However, please reserve the time instead for individual telcons/mtgs with me to be held during that time period to address: 10-10:30:concern statements(Michael), 10:30-10:45: cost recovery assumptions(Todd), and 10:45-11:15: CDW monitoring in the field by LE(Kevin or Randy). Please advise as to your availability to discuss these at the aforementioned times.

Thanks,

Mike

PS. Michael just plugged in a time slot in case you were not able to do today.

On Wed, Jun 18, 2014 at 1:31 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Sorry forgot to attach draft agenda below for our meeting this Friday. Please confirm your participation, and prepare for respective agenda items.
Thank you.

Mike

PS. Michael may be still out on leave.

On Wed, Jun 18, 2014 at 1:29 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

On Thu, Jun 5, 2014 at 5:16 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Still on for 10-11AM tomorrow for our dog mgt coord mtg. Attached is draft agenda. Telcon line will be same as always(in agenda attached).

Mike

On Thu, May 29, 2014 at 4:25 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi All,
On for 10AM tomorrow mtg in Frank's office to briefly check in on interim action, with James Sword if Jeni not available, and then move on to our other agenda items on rule, long term plan, FOIA and WASO mtgs. [James-only need your attendance if any issues have surfaced thru SPUG or BusM on permit.]

Please let me know if you have other agenda items by 9AM tomorrow.

thank you.

Mike

On Thu, May 22, 2014 at 5:24 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi all,
Still on for 10-10:30AM tomorrow for our dog mgt coord mtg. Attached is draft agenda. Telcon line will be same as always(in agenda attached). This meeting will be dedicated to finalizing interim actions for CDWs, and be shortened to allow time for responders to address BG's comments by 1PM PST.

Thanks,

Mike

To: Christine Lee[CLee@indecon.com]
Cc: Edwards, Michael (michael_b_edwards@nps.gov)[michael_b_edwards@nps.gov]; Boltz, Suzanne[sboltz@eaest.com]; Christine Carey[christine_carey@partner.nps.gov]
From: Savidge, Michael
Sent: Thur 6/26/2014 6:23:47 PM
Importance: Normal
Subject: Re: Econ analsyes for dog mgt plan: input form you all
Received: Thur 6/26/2014 6:23:48 PM

Christine,
Yes...Christine Carey is our park planner for San Mateo, and she can connect you to the most knowledgeable San Mateo field staff: her number is (415)561-4745.

She can then get you the other numbers for Suzy Bennett and others on the ground..like Maintenance and LE folks who can best give you understanding of what's happening in field in terms of characterizing CDW use for example in an area.

James Sword is back on Monday, and would be good contact about differences between NPS CDWs(requesting permits) and those with permits from CCSF to gauge overlap now.

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Mike

On Thu, Jun 26, 2014 at 9:56 AM, Christine Lee <CLee@indecon.com> wrote:

Hi Mike,

I hope this email finds you doing well.

I talked this week with Katie Beltrano, Jeni Treutelaar and just this morning with Alex Picavet. My discussions were super helpful and I want to thank you and your team for their collective time and institutional knowledge. I have not connected with Kevin Cochary yet, but I plan to follow-up with him later today/tomorrow.

I am just looking back at my notes from my discussion with Shirwin and I have a few additional names that she suggested I talk with, but she did not have contact information for these individuals. I wanted to see whether you might know these individuals, or could point me to someone on your team who might know them:

- San Mateo Animal Care and Control: Christina Carey

- Law enforcement in San Mateo: Suzy Bennett and Rachel Lewis

Finally in talking with Katie Beltrano, it seems that connecting with James Sword would be good to do as well once he is back in the office. Can you remind me when he is back in the office?

Now that we have completed most of our calls with GGNRA staff, we are going to revisit our notes from those calls and then begin contacting local animal care and control representatives. Once we start reaching out to those folks, I will provide everyone another update.

All best, Christine

Christine Lee
Industrial Economics, Incorporated (IEc)
San Francisco, CA
415.839.5118
http://www.indecon.com/

Mailing Address:
2067 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02140

From: Savidge, Michael [mailto:michael_j_savidge@nps.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 7:47 PM
To: Kathleen Beltrano; Jennifer Treutelaar; Kevin Cochary; Alexandra Picavet
Cc: Christine Lee
Subject: Re: Econ analsyes for dog mgt plan: input form you all

Hi all,

I am providing our consultant on the econ analyses, Christine Lee(copied here), with your work phone numbers(below) to be able to move forward on our economic analyses. She has some questions that I referred to in my earlier e-mail to you on 6/11 that you all can fill her in on directly.

I recognize that there may be some added refinements to some of our thoughts on stuff like cost recovery, and have informed Christine that that will not be ready until later next week. The data breakdown that James was offering at our dog mgt coord mtg today would be useful input that perhaps, Katie, you can share with Christine in Jame's absence next week. There was also one point of contact with SF SPCA who had been involved in training in GGNRA with Shirwin that, Alex, you might recall and share with Christine as well. Finally, Kevin, to degree that you or your staff can characterize commercial dogwalking at different sites at any one time, weekdays vs. weekends, that would also be useful.

As I have noted before, if there are any questions that any of you are uncomfortable with, please just relay that to her, and me afterwards so that I can address.

thanks all for you help with this,

Mike

PS. We will also have an oppty to review her draft prior to finalizing.

Names	Numbers
Katie Beltrano	(415)561-4948
James Sword	(415)561-4373
Kevin Cochary	(415)-289-3131

Jeni Treutelaar (415)561-4949

Alex Picavet (415)786-8021

On Wed, Jun 11, 2014 at 4:59 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi all,

We are required to do an econ analyses for draft dog rule going back to WASO this summer; and, there is input that our contractor, Industrial Economics, would like to get from us that you all are better positioned to provide such as:

1. permit costs and CDWs comments about costs in process of permitting(Katie and/or James)

2. our cost recovery on CDWs(Jeni)

3. field characterizations(Kevin?) on CDWs/dogwalkers at particular sites

I would like to pass on your work numbers to Christine Lee who is doing local analyses for them so that she can follow up next week with you on this as it is on fast track to be done. if you feel uncomfortable with any particular Q related to this econ analyses, you can always relay that to her, and me afterwards to address. We will get an oppty to review their draft and final reports.

If there is a time/date that works better for you, please indicate that back to me with your confirmation that she can contact you directly.

Thanks,

Mike

To: 'Savidge, Michael'[michael_j_savidge@nps.gov]
Cc: Edwards, Michael (michael_b_edwards@nps.gov)[michael_b_edwards@nps.gov]; Boltz, Suzanne[sboltz@eaest.com]; Christine Carey[christine_carey@partner.nps.gov]
From: Christine Lee
Sent: Thur 6/26/2014 6:28:03 PM
Importance: Normal
Subject: RE: Econ analsyes for dog mgt plan: input form you all
Received: Thur 6/26/2014 6:28:05 PM

Hi Mike,

Thank you very much for the quick follow-up – I appreciate it!

All best, Christine

Christine Lee
Industrial Economics, Incorporated (IEc)
San Francisco, CA
415.839.5118
http://www.indecon.com/

Mailing Address:
2067 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02140

From: Savidge, Michael [mailto:michael_j_savidge@nps.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 2:24 PM
To: Christine Lee
Cc: Edwards, Michael (michael_b_edwards@nps.gov); Boltz, Suzanne; Christine Carey
Subject: Re: Econ analsyes for dog mgt plan: input form you all

Christine,

Yes...Christine Carey is our park planner for San Mateo, and she can connect you to the most knowledgeable San Mateo field staff: her number is (415)561-4745.

She can then get you the other numbers for Suzy Bennett and others on the ground..like Maintenance and LE folks who can best give you understanding of what's happening in field in terms of characterizing CDW use for example in an area.

James Sword is back on Monday, and would be good contact about differences between NPS CDWs(requesting permits) and those with permits from CCSF to gauge overlap now.

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Mike

On Thu, Jun 26, 2014 at 9:56 AM, Christine Lee <CLee@indecon.com> wrote:

Hi Mike,

I hope this email finds you doing well.

I talked this week with Katie Beltrano, Jeni Treutelaar and just this morning with Alex Picavet. My discussions were super helpful and I want to thank you and your team for their collective time and institutional knowledge. I have not connected with Kevin Cochary yet, but I plan to follow-up with him later today/tomorrow.

I am just looking back at my notes from my discussion with Shirwin and I have a few additional names that she suggested I talk with, but she did not have contact information for these individuals. I wanted to see whether you might know these individuals, or could point me to someone on your team who might know them:

- San Mateo Animal Care and Control: Christina Carey

- Law enforcement in San Mateo: Suzy Bennett and Rachel Lewis

Finally in talking with Katie Beltrano, it seems that connecting with James Sword would be good to do as well once he is back in the office. Can you remind me when he is back in the office?

Now that we have completed most of our calls with GGNRA staff, we are going to revisit our notes from those calls and then begin contacting local animal care and control representatives. Once we start reaching out to those folks, I will provide everyone another update.

All best, Christine

Christine Lee
Industrial Economics, Incorporated (IEc)
San Francisco, CA
415.839.5118
http://www.indecon.com/

Mailing Address:
2067 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02140

From: Savidge, Michael [mailto:michael_j_savidge@nps.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 7:47 PM
To: Kathleen Beltrano; Jennifer Treutelaar; Kevin Cochary; Alexandra Picavet
Cc: Christine Lee
Subject: Re: Econ analsyes for dog mgt plan: input form you all

Hi all,

I am providing our consultant on the econ analyses, Christine Lee(copied here), with your work phone numbers(below) to be able to move forward on our economic analyses. She has some questions that I referred to in my earlier e-mail to you on 6/11 that you all can fill her in on directly.

I recognize that there may be some added refinements to some of our thoughts on stuff like cost recovery, and have informed Christine that that will not be ready until later next week. The data breakdown that James was offering at our dog mgt coord mtg today would be useful input that perhaps, Katie, you can share with Christine in Jame's absence next week. There was also one point of contact with SF SPCA who had been involved in training in GGNRA with Shirwin that, Alex, you might recall and share with Christine as well. Finally, Kevin, to degree that you or your staff can characterize commercial dogwalking at different sites at any one time, weekdays vs. weekends, that would also be useful.

As I have noted before, if there are any questions that any of you are uncomfortable with, please just relay that to her, and me afterwards so that I can address.

thanks all for you help with this,

Mike

PS. We will also have an oppty to review her draft prior to finalizing.

Names	Numbers
Katie Beltrano	(415)561-4948
James Sword	(415)561-4373
Kevin Cochary	(415)-289-3131
Jeni Treutelaar	(415)561-4949
Alex Picavet	(415)786-8021

On Wed, Jun 11, 2014 at 4:59 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi all,

We are required to do an econ analyses for draft dog rule going back to WASO this summer; and, there is input that our contractor, Industrial Economics, would like to get from us that you all are better positioned to provide such as:

1. permit costs and CDWs comments about costs in process of permitting(Katie and/or James)

2. our cost recovery on CDWs(Jeni)

3. field characterizations(Kevin?) on CDWs/dogwalkers at particular sites

I would like to pass on your work numbers to Christine Lee who is doing local analyses for them so that she can follow up next week with you on this as it is on fast track to be done. if you feel uncomfortable with any particular Q related to this econ analyses, you can always relay that to her, and me afterwards to address. We will get an oppty to review their draft and final reports.

If there is a time/date that works better for you, please indicate that back to me with your confirmation that she can contact you directly.

Thanks,

Mike

To: Christine Carey[christine_carey@partner.nps.gov]
Cc: Edwards, Michael (michael_b_edwards@nps.gov)[michael_b_edwards@nps.gov]; Boltz, Suzanne[sboltz@eaest.com]; 'Savidge, Michael'[michael_j_savidge@nps.gov]
From: Christine Lee
Sent: Thur 6/26/2014 6:29:35 PM
Importance: Normal
Subject: RE: Econ analsyes for dog mgt plan: input form you all
Received: Thur 6/26/2014 6:29:44 PM

Hi Christine,

My name is Christine Lee, with Industrial Economics, Inc.; our group is working on the economic analysis for the upcoming dog management rule.

I was wondering if you might have a half hour or so this week to talk with me briefly about use of GGNRA by commercial dog walkers in the San Mateo area.

Please let me know a time in the next few days that would work for you.

Thank you in advance for your time and I look forward to talking with you soon.

All best, Christine

Christine Lee
Industrial Economics, Incorporated (IEc)
San Francisco, CA
415.839.5118
http://www.indecon.com/

Mailing Address:
2067 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02140

From: Savidge, Michael [mailto:michael_j_savidge@nps.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 2:24 PM
To: Christine Lee
Cc: Edwards, Michael (michael_b_edwards@nps.gov); Boltz, Suzanne; Christine Carey
Subject: Re: Econ analsyes for dog mgt plan: input form you all

Christine,

Yes...Christine Carey is our park planner for San Mateo, and she can connect you to the most knowledgeable San Mateo field staff: her number is (415)561-4745.

She can then get you the other numbers for Suzy Bennett and others on the ground..like Maintenance and LE folks who can best give you understanding of what's happening in field in terms of characterizing CDW use for example in an area.

James Sword is back on Monday, and would be good contact about differences between NPS CDWs(requesting permits) and those with permits from CCSF to gauge overlap now.

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Mike

On Thu, Jun 26, 2014 at 9:56 AM, Christine Lee <CLee@indecon.com> wrote:

Hi Mike,

I hope this email finds you doing well.

I talked this week with Katie Beltrano, Jeni Treutelaar and just this morning with Alex Picavet. My discussions were super helpful and I want to thank you and your team for their collective time and institutional knowledge. I have not connected with Kevin Cochary yet, but I plan to follow-up with him later today/tomorrow.

I am just looking back at my notes from my discussion with Shirwin and I have a few additional names that she suggested I talk with, but she did not have contact information for these individuals. I wanted to see whether you might know these individuals, or could point me to someone on your team who might know them:

- San Mateo Animal Care and Control: Christina Carey

- Law enforcement in San Mateo: Suzy Bennett and Rachel Lewis

Finally in talking with Katie Beltrano, it seems that connecting with James Sword would be good to do as well once he is back in the office. Can you remind me when he is back in the office?

Now that we have completed most of our calls with GGNRA staff, we are going to revisit our notes from those calls and then begin contacting local animal care and control representatives. Once we start reaching out to those folks, I will provide everyone another update.

All best, Christine

Christine Lee
Industrial Economics, Incorporated (IEc)
San Francisco, CA
415.839.5118
http://www.indecon.com/

Mailing Address:
2067 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02140

From: Savidge, Michael [mailto:michael_j_savidge@nps.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 7:47 PM
To: Kathleen Beltrano; Jennifer Treutelaar; Kevin Cochary; Alexandra Picavet
Cc: Christine Lee
Subject: Re: Econ analsyes for dog mgt plan: input form you all

Hi all,

I am providing our consultant on the econ analyses, Christine Lee(copied here), with your work phone numbers(below) to be able to move forward on our economic analyses. She has some questions that I referred to in my earlier e-mail to you on 6/11 that you all can fill her in on directly.

I recognize that there may be some added refinements to some of our thoughts on stuff like cost recovery, and have informed Christine that that will not be ready until later next week. The data breakdown that James was offering at our dog mgt coord mtg today would be useful input that perhaps, Katie, you can share with Christine in Jame's absence next week. There was also one point of contact with SF SPCA who had been involved in training in GGNRA with Shirwin that, Alex, you might recall and share with Christine as well. Finally, Kevin, to degree that you or your staff can characterize commercial dogwalking at different sites at any one time, weekdays vs. weekends, that would also be useful.

As I have noted before, if there are any questions that any of you are uncomfortable with, please just relay that to her, and me afterwards so that I can address.

thanks all for you help with this,

Mike

PS. We will also have an oppty to review her draft prior to finalizing.

Names	Numbers
Katie Beltrano	(415)561-4948
James Sword	(415)561-4373
Kevin Cochary	(415)-289-3131
Jeni Treutelaar	(415)561-4949
Alex Picavet	(415)786-8021

On Wed, Jun 11, 2014 at 4:59 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi all,

We are required to do an econ analyses for draft dog rule going back to WASO this summer; and, there is input that our contractor, Industrial Economics, would like to get from us that you all are better positioned to provide such as:

1. permit costs and CDWs comments about costs in process of permitting(Katie and/or James)

2. our cost recovery on CDWs(Jeni)

3. field characterizations(Kevin?) on CDWs/dogwalkers at particular sites

I would like to pass on your work numbers to Christine Lee who is doing local analyses for them so that she can follow up next week with you on this as it is on fast track to be done. if you feel uncomfortable with any particular Q related to this econ analyses, you can always relay that to her, and me afterwards to address. We will get an oppty to review their draft and final reports.

If there is a time/date that works better for you, please indicate that back to me with your confirmation that she can contact you directly.

Thanks,

Mike

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/28/2014)

AD1100 Alternative Development: Comments to Process (Substantive)

1. **Several concerns were expressed about the work of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee. Concern was expressed about the process used by the committee, specifically who could participate and what topics could be discussed. It was also stated that the SEIS did not incorporate the results of the committee's work.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 4276 **Comment Id:** 362349 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I live in San Mateo County and served as an alternate on the negotiated rule making committee representing Pacifica. (San Bruno was left out of the negotiations as well as the residents of the coastside communities of Montara and Moss Beach south of Pacifica who have been severely impacted by the Dog Management Plan.) The units in San Mateo County were never actually discussed-each time Jeri Flinn attempted to bring them up, she was told "not now". Cattle Hill (which the NPS had actually proposed as an off-leash appropriate area) couldn't be discussed because it wasn't actually part of the GGNRA yet! Same was true of Pedro Point and Rancho Corral de Tierra (4000 acres where there has to be space for off-leash recreation). In the "Plan", areas that have been open to on-leash walking are now off limits to dogs (and therefore their people). We went into the Negotiated Rule Making in order (as the NPS said) to make a long time use of areas in the GGNRA legitimate (though a federal judge had indeed found that the 1979 Pet Policy was a legitimate policy).Instead, the NPS used the process to severely restrict a recreational use that thousands of Bay Area residents enjoy on a daily or weekly basis.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Farrow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5815 **Comment Id:** 364358 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Negotiated Rulemaking Committee worked very hard to come up with a plan that had consensus among the many GGNRA stakeholders. Alternative F disregards the majority of the consensus recommendations from the Committee. I support Alternative C as the best alternative for revising the plan. I am strongly opposed to Alternative B which severely limits my ability to participate in GGNRA outdoor recreation.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate Clayton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369173 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Despite the fact that GGNRA management had been given permission to create

a Section Seven Special Regulation for off-leash recreation in the GGNRA by the Federal Panel and by the Court when the Court reinstated the 1979 Pet Policy, the Superintendent refused to make the 1979 Pet Policy a Section Seven Special Regulation. He instead instituted a Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) process that was conducted in bad faith, was unlawful and did not reach consensus. The GGNRA refused to acknowledge the 1979 Pet Policy as the logical starting point for NR. In fact, the 1979 Pet Policy was not listed as a document the NR Committee would be able to refer to within the NR process. The GGNRA continued to cling to their view that the 1979 Pet Policy was an illegitimate document which NEVER had the power of law despite the contrary findings of the Court.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. The community should have been more involved in the development of alternatives, either through the use of workshops or the consultation of interested groups, such as dog training professionals.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6435 **Comment Id:** 367488 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My surprise has always been that there has never been any input or consult from Bay Area Dog Training Professionals on this specifically dog focused legislation and its restrictions. The GGNRA and the DEIS reporting has never sought out the advice and suggestions from this highly canine educated population who are here and more than willing to contribute. These people also frequently use these off leash areas because of the benefit it provides to dogs in their care (both personal and professionally) on so many levels: mental stimulation, socialization, exercise and all around positive effect of these factors results in a more behaved dog. I strongly feel that the draft needs to be redone including the input of dog care professionals along with establishing outreach programs for dog owners on how to respectfully share the park with other users and wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: Natalie Tondelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4005 **Comment Id:** 368803 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: To improve on the plan, GGNRA should return to the first two goals stated from its Scoping conclusions (page 39 of the SDEIS): "Work toward community acceptance of the process and the solution" and "Allow the community to participate, maximizing creative thinking." To date, other than the reg neg process, NPS has mainly involved the community by providing opportunities to comment on formal plan/NEPA documents. Upon receiving comments, GGNRA has not allowed the community to participate in the planning process until the agency issued its next formal document, many months later. This does not meet the spirit or letter of the above objectives. For example, NPS has held no design workshops or design charrettes on any potential solutions in any GGNRA unit, a standard method San Francisco and many federal agencies and municipalities use to develop solutions to sensitive or controversial

areas or areas with user conflicts. These techniques were not used in the reg neg process, in the scoping process for the EIS, or in the comment periods on the DEIS or SDEIS. NPS is again requested to recognize both the relevance of urban design and initiate design workshops on focused issues that can help produce a good plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Kenneth S Weiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(06/18/2014)

AL5000 Comments on Dog walking Permit System (Substantive)

1. **One commenter stated concern about the level of experience of commercial dog walkers and feels that all dog walkers should be required to complete certain levels of training before obtaining a permit to walk 6 dogs off leash.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 205 **Comment Id:** 350108 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I do want to comment about the commercial dog walkers and the owners of multiple dogs that walk at Fort Funston. I feel that the commercial dog walkers do include experts but this group also includes some individuals with much less training. I believe ALL walkers (commercial / private citizens) should be required to complete pack management training and dog training certifications before being permitted to walk more than TWO dogs off leash or on. I would be thrilled to see a permit of this nature that required the walkers to carry a photo id badge whenever walking dogs anywhere in the city. Dog trainers with pack management training are very capable of walking six dogs off leash in an open space like Fort Funston. Fort Funston is ideal for dog hikes as its layout is quite safe for them. Certainly, I believe an upgrade of commercial dog walking guidelines needs to be considered. Dog trainers with pack management training are the best qualified to walk 6 dogs off leash. Those without this training would definitely be less able to guide dogs..though I am sure there are some that have a natural gift, I would prefer they all be formally trained. Those without formal training could perhaps apprentice with those more qualified.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda S Barcellos **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Several commenters believe that commercial dog walkers should have to pay a fee to obtain a permit to use Golden Gate National Recreation Area. These commenters feel that this fee would benefit the park and could be used to help fund programs to monitor or improve the park's resources. The fee could also reduce the number of commercial dog walkers because not all dog walkers would want to pay the fee.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1606 **Comment Id:** 353186 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I would support permit requirements for all dog walkers at the parks, with the fees to be used to fund monitoring and education programs. I would also support user permits for non- -dog-walkers, as well. These parks are beautiful, and we should all be willing to spend money to keep them that way.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5181 **Comment Id:** 362475 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: No matter what an area is designated have professional or even non professionals that have more than one dog should pay a concession use licensing fee to use an area. Have them register, license, and pay the fee with NPS and in return NPS supplies the permit. This would aid in conflicts, dog incidents, and even assist in identifying owners if necessary for enforcement.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Some commenters believe that permits for commercial dog walking are unnecessary, as San Francisco city and county already have permitting in place and Golden Gate National Recreation Area has clearly marked signage explaining the number of allowable dogs.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 361 **Comment Id:** 351152 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Permits: It is not clear to me that the requirement for permits for dog walkers with 4 to 6 dogs is worthwhile. It seems that signs posted on the trails and fire roads designating the allowable times more than 3 dogs could be walked beyond that point would serve the same purpose just as well, and would save both dog walkers and the Park Service a lot of administrative paperwork. But I have no strong opposition to permits so long as they are free and easily obtained. So while I favor Alternative A on permitting, Alternative F is acceptable.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Hollingsworth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 375 **Comment Id:** 351283 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Permits for commercial dog walking are unnecessary and restrictive. City & county of SF already have this in place!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. **Some commenters support the use of permits for larger groups of dogs, stating that issues arise at Golden Gate National Recreation Area with larger groups of off leash dogs. One commenter suggested that the permitting for the park be in line with that of the city of San Francisco with a limit of 6 dogs per person.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 801 **Comment Id:** 353310 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I want to stress the importance of limiting the number of dogs in a group to six,

and to require permits for groups larger than three. I have worked in Fort Funston as a Parks Conservancy employee and a volunteer. I have been doing volunteer work at Fort Funston for almost 15 years. I have had very few bad interactions with dogs. However, the couple that did occur are generally with large (> 5) packs. I have also noticed that the animals in such groups are rarely well controlled and often range far off the trails, while dogs being walked individually or in pairs generally keep more or less to designated trails. Thus the restrictions on number of dogs that can be walked is essential.

Organization:

Commenter: John P Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6635 **Comment Id:** 367557 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe the GGNRA needs to carefully differentiate between recreational and professional dog walkers. I think the GGNRA should do as the City of San Francisco has done and issue permits that limit the number of dogs walked at one time. Perhaps they could even limit the number of permits issued.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea Patterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Other Comments

Exemption 5

Correspondence Id: 252 **Comment Id:** 350358 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Regarding professional dog walkers, limit them to five dogs, and perhaps license them with an appropriate fee to maintain adherence.

Organization:

Commenter: Ronald L Giuntini **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 331 **Comment Id:** 350595 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Commercial Dog Walking -permits for 6 dogs should be on-leash only. It's too many dogs for one person to control, especially around families with children -permits should be visible - like fishing license

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 361 **Comment Id:** 351152 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Permits: It is not clear to me that the requirement for permits for dog walkers with 4 to 6 dogs is worthwhile. It seems that signs posted on the trails and fire roads designating the allowable times more than 3 dogs could be walked beyond that point would serve the same purpose just as well, and would save both dog walkers and the Park Service a lot of administrative paperwork. But I have no strong opposition to permits so long as they are free and easily obtained. So while I favor Alternative A on permitting, Alternative F is acceptable.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Hollingsworth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 375 **Comment Id:** 351283 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Permits for commercial dog walking are unnecessary and restrictive. City & county of SF already have this in place!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 432 **Comment Id:** 351360 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I also agree with setting limits on the number of dogs one person can walk, with permits required for numbers above those limits.

Organization:

Commenter: Craig L Wiesner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1035 **Comment Id:** 351462 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: One possible solution to offset the cost is to require dog walkers to obtain park permits. They are essentially using public land to operate a private business and they make money from that business. This would be a "business use fee" and could even be applied for commercial sightseeing buses that bring tourists to Ft. Funston.

Organization:

Commenter: Arthur Storey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1431 **Comment Id:** 352542 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do think that professional dog walkers should have some limits on the number they can have off-leash at any time and should have responsibilities for helping keep our trails clean. I believe if they received GGNRA permits for a fee, that fee could help offset providing additional trash cans/garbage bags to make cleaning up poop easy.

Organization:

Commenter: Robin v Van Vliet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 782 **Comment Id:** 353282 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The number of commercial dog walkers and the number of dogs they are permitted to walk should be strictly limited with a high permit fee to be used to maintain the off-lease fenced areas and to pay for clean-up, enforcement, and resolution of dog-related conflicts.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura Fujii **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 801 **Comment Id:** 353311 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, the regulations in the GGNRA, at least those areas in San Francisco proper, should be consistent with the city of San Francisco regulations, which require a maximum of six dogs per walk (http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=1083) and a permit for professional walkers (http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=3857). If regulations in the GGNRA do not align with those of the City, every would-be professional walker who can not get a City license will walk their dogs in the GGNRA. For simplicity of paperwork, both for the Park Service and the walkers, it might be easiest to simply require that professional walkers have a City license.

Organization:

Commenter: John P Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1667 **Comment Id:** 353511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you need to ask dogwalkers to register and put a cap on the number of dogs one can take - fine. Cap it at 5 dogs. That allows the walker to make some money. Don't punish all of us because of complaints from a few people.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa Brinkmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1856 **Comment Id:** 354379 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Professional dog walkers often have as many as 9-10 dogs. The worst offenders are those that do not keep them on leash. But even on leash, no one can effectively manage that many dogs. Professional dog watchers should be limited to a maximum of 4 dogs and only permitted in certain, non sensitive areas. Professional dog walkers should also be charged fees for their use of the park and required to have permits as other vendors in the Park are required.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean Colvin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4059 **Comment Id:** 360630 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: professional dog walkers should be charged like any concessionaire conducting business on park lands

Organization:

Commenter: Joy Durighello **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4823 **Comment Id:** 361598 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Why was it ever allowed that DOG WALKERS may "walk" 10 plus dogs at a time? Many of these dogs are loosely under voice control. That would mean that they eventually come when called but, only after they have sniffed out every bird, trampled plantings and eliminated just about any old place they wish! Why not require additional, recognizable licenses of every dog that profits from the open space we so desperately want? If there was for example, a large red heart hanging from the collar of every dog we see on and off leash in open spaces, we would all know that dollars had been paid for the privilege. Owners would feel more responsibility if they knew that a hefty fine would follow if the license was not visible. Additionally, all the rest of us would know who paid and who did not.

Organization:

Commenter: Carmelita and Bill Ellis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366090 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Park Service wishes to accommodate visitors that have more than two dogs

per visitor, the Service should explore a permitting system that ensures that the visitor is able to control more than two dogs at one time. Any such permitting system should (1) include an educational component, (2) a test of the visitor's ability to handle multiple dogs, (3) active enforcement of the permit requirement, and (4) be cost-neutral to the Service (i.e., paid for by those receiving the permit).

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6265 **Comment Id:** 366363 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To help manage the dog population, you should look into permits for people who use the Fort for business. Charge a fee for permits and limit the number of dogs to 12. I'm sure you'll see the numbers drop radically and you can use the funds for park improvement. (a real bathroom would be great!!)

Organization:

Commenter: Jeannine K Yep **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/28/2014)

AW1000 Animal Welfare: Impact on/to dogs (Substantive)

1. **Many commenters believe that off leash exercise is the key to keeping their dogs mentally and physically healthy. The off leash areas of Golden Gate National Recreation Area provide dogs and their owners' relief from congested city life. Without these open natural areas, many dog owners feel that their dogs would suffer, as their physical and social needs could not be met and their quality of life would be degraded. Conversely, several commenters stated that on-leash exercise has been just as effective in maintaining their dog's health and more on leash restrictions would not cause any suffering.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1447 **Comment Id:** 352577 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On-leash areas do not provide the same outlet as off-leash areas. For some dogs, this is not as much of an issue. For others, it makes all the difference between a well-behaved dog and one that turns to mischief or worse. Because of the density of the human population, one might argue that it's even more important for dogs who live in an urban area to have the proper outlet for their energy. As an example, my dog (26 lbs) was rescued from a shelter. He had previously been a stray and so is very fearful. We have taken several obedience classes and used private training, but his fear is deeply ingrained. He won't walk farther than 1/2 block in either direction from our house, which certainly doesn't give him the proper amount of exercise. However, he feels safe at Fort Funston and at beaches, so we take him off-leash there so he can get the proper exercise. If we don't take him, he is definitely more difficult to manage. These off-leash areas make a huge difference - - walking him on-leash at these places is not nearly as effective

Organization:

Commenter: Gina Luzzi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1925 **Comment Id:** 354563 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Some of the best off-leash training work I've done with my dog has been at the beaches, where there are canine distractions, no fences, and new stimuli (sand, sea smells, birds) that compete with her attention. The training successes translate into a dog who is confident, calm, and able to listen to commands in spite of distractions around the busy streets of Richmond, Berkeley, and El Cerrito where we walk. The benefit is not only for me and my dog, but for everyone who she comes into contact with.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate M Denevan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3821 **Comment Id:** 359906 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our rescue dog was extremely fearful of people and because we have been bringing her to Crissy Field she has improved immensely. She can't wait to get out of the car when we get to the park, she manages herself very well and has a great time running and playing with the other dogs. Please keep the park as it is, the park is truly a park for all, we love it.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia D Lima **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Several commenters stated that the off leash areas of Golden Gate National Recreation Area have helped rehabilitate their dogs suffering from various conditions, ranging from anxiety to hip dysplasia. The beaches also provide excellent conditions to train dogs to listen to their handlers, despite immense distractions.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1172 **Comment Id:** 351898 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Over a 30 year period, our family had the pleasure of owning two dogs, consecutively. As we lived in the City, we wouldn't think of allowing our dogs to run freely without a leash. I never observed that the dogs felt "deprived". When walking them, if we came to an "open area" where unleashed pets were allowed, we untied them.

Organization: Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

Commenter: Alice Abbott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4975 **Comment Id:** 361878 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My daily off leash walks with my dog enhance my quality of life in a way that is far superior to walking with the dog on a leash. I can walk at my pace and she can sniff and run at her pace. The level of stress relief is wonderful for both of us. Dogs interact with each other much more calmly off leash. They can actually play. Dog play, which is very important for the well-being of the dog and of tremendous enjoyment to their humans is not possible on leash.

Organization: Sierra Club

Commenter: Annemarie A Donjacour **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5349 **Comment Id:** 363000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is critical to the emotional and physical health of dogs to be able to exercise fully. This is rarely possible on leash or in small postage stamp sized "dog areas" If dogs are not given adequate exercise they are prone to more physical health problems. More importantly they often exhibit more behavior problems that affect people. As a veterinarian of 30 years I can tell you that dogs that need exercise and do not get it are more likely to have aggression related issues, including dog bites. I am concerned that if you do you not continue to provide space for dogs to run you will see an increase in the incidence of dog related problems.

Organization:
Commenter: Pamela Bouchard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6666 **Comment Id:** 369538 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As the SF SPCA can attest, daily exercise is essential to a dog's proper health and well-being. Exercise affects a dog's behavior, trainability and aggression levels, which are important to properly maintaining public safety in crowded urban environments. Take away off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA, and dog guardians may be unable to meet the physical and mental needs of their pets (also at a detriment to their own healthy, active lifestyles).
Organization: San Francisco SPCA
Commenter: Brandy Kuentzel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. **Commenters stated that dogs act differently on leash and in confined, fenced-in areas than they do when they are unrestricted. Leashes can make some dogs feel trapped. When their natural reaction to avoid a situation is eliminated, dogs can sometimes resort to acting defensively or aggressively. Additionally, other local parks are overcrowded, which does not give dogs the same experiences as recreating in wide open spaces.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 153 **Comment Id:** 349879 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Many dogs are aggressive on leash, dogs that are normally passive and playful. After working in shelters and privately training dogs for years, I can tell you that dogs need a lot of exercise and socializing, and they are not able to do it well while restricted on a leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah R Gherini **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1362 **Comment Id:** 352394 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog behaviorists will inform you that off leash exercise is essential to the physical and behavioral health of all larger canines. Frankly, I was a bit surprised at the sheer number of dogs over 50# that daily attended Fort Funston. One might expect a few less, in an area so deficient in open space. It is well known that dogs greet each other best when left to their own devices, the act of restraining a dog, in the presence of another, can instigate violent behavior. The disparity in the numbers of bad incidents at Fort Funston, as opposed to those of Crissy Field seem to bear that out. We all know the damage to life and property that an out of control 75# dog can do... In the interest of public safety, the only logical course of action would be to leave a good thing alone.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher F Norgaar **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

4. One commenter believes that dogs should be banned from Golden Gate National Recreation Area completely, as well as the city of San Francisco, stating that it is inhumane to keep dogs confined inside houses and apartments all day with small amounts of exercise.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 126 **Comment Id:** 346277 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This plan allows for too many areas for dogs. Dogs should be banned fron the GGNRA. Dogs are destructive. There are too many dogs in the city which is a place that is not suitable for dogs. In part dogs are kept in tiny apartments because dog owners use the open space in the GGNRA as an excuse to this. They rationalize to themselves that walking their dog for 1 hour a day and the rest of the time keeping the dog in a tiny apartment is fair and healthy for their dog. It is not. Dogs are not meant to be in cities especially big dogs. By allowing dogs in the GGNRA you are supporting cruelty to animals.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. Many commenters feel that restricting off leash access at Golden Gate National Recreation Area will ultimately lead to an increase in euthanasia rates in the city's shelters. These commenters feel that restricting areas where dogs can run will create behavior problems, which will lead to owners surrendering their dogs to the shelters.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1890 **Comment Id:** 354462 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Francisco sets a very strong example for the rest of the nation with our achievements in terms of humane animal welfare. Animal Shelters from around the country have commended our city and county for having the highest adoption to dog birth ratio in the country where elsewhere dog overpopulation is a problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Gilbert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2883 **Comment Id:** 354906 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It doesn't take much for a dog owner to throw their hands up in desperation and abandon a pet, should the access to facilities be com e difficult. With a plan like GGNRA Dog Management Plan there is certain to be an impact on shelters, rescue adoption agencies and dog training/walking facilities as an increasing number of dog owners will abandon their pets. We already face extreme issues with overcrowding in shelters and stray animal control - why then force beloved pet owners to have to give up their pet when it could be otherwise avoided.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Alita Macias **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 3 **Comment Id:** 337953 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Eliminating areas where dogs (under voice control) are able to run freely with make those few parks in San Francisco with off leash areas more crowded than they already are. It will negatively impact the health and welfare of dogs and their owners. It will increase pollution by forcing people to drive further to reach an off leash area.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel M Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 11 **Comment Id:** 337966 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: 1) The revised plan still does not seem to recognize that dogs are biologically engineered to retrieve balls and sticks, preferably from the water. No dog can retrieve a stick while on a leash, is that so hard to understand? This "plan" is nothing more than a veiled invitation to euthanize our dogs, and it is therefore despicable.

Organization:

Commenter: Marcel p Houtzager **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 109 **Comment Id:** 343888 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Faithful companions to humans dogs have animal rights. Confining them to short walks on tight leashes, in crowded dog parks or crammed backyards is un-natural, stressful, dangerous and cruel.

Organization: Pythom Inc

Commenter: Tina O Sjogren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 142 **Comment Id:** 346306 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Fenced in dog runs are not sufficient for the number of dogs in San Francisco and they are not sufficient for providing the exercise that dogs need. The same is true for keeping dogs leashed - that does not provide sufficient exercise for dogs to remain healthy.

Organization:

Commenter: Christian Knuetter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 145 **Comment Id:** 346310 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are many studies done that show that off-leash exercise is vital to canine health and I am saddened by the proposed plan to limit this kind of exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: elizabeth mccormick **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 148 **Comment Id:** 346315 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE do not further restrict off-leash exercise for our dogs! We take our dogs to Rodeo Beach regularly, and to Crissy Field, Baker Beach and other GGNRA locations intermittently. Our dogs need lots of exercise; one of them is not good in enclosed spaces with other dogs. It is vital to their well-being that they get some time to be out running around. Our dogs are both completely under voice control and well-behaved in open spaces. We always obey all rules to keep them away from wild life and we always clean up after them. There are SO few places in the Bay Area that they can run free. PLEASE don't take the little space they have away from them. Dog owners are citizens, too. Our voices should count.
Organization:
Commenter: Nina Anne M Greeley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 157 **Comment Id:** 349891 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is not possible for most breeds of dog to get enough exercise on leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Deborah S Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 174 **Comment Id:** 349982 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I have a two year old rescue dog. He's a Jack Russell and Miniature Greyhound mix. He has a lot of energy and his favorite thing (besides chicken) is running. I run an 8 min mile and I've run him up to 10 miles on leash however it doesn't compare to the exercise he gets when he's allowed to run off leash. On leash, I can only go fast enough that he trots. Off leash, he runs like a greyhound complete with the greyhound smile. Eliminating areas where he can exercise properly will negatively affect his health no matter how much I exercise him on leash. My dog has never been aggressive to another animal (human or canine). I believe this is because of how he is trained and because he is well exercised. Reducing the amount of healthy exercise dogs can get in the city will not help any aggression issue. (This is the dog whisperers biggest thing right?)
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 190 **Comment Id:** 350042 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I travel the 13 miles to Ft. Funston once a week so that my 9-year-old dog can enjoy running and socializing with other dogs without the restrictions of a leash. Ft. Funston is unique among off-leash dog parks because the humans walking the trail provide structure to the

experience. In a traditional dog park, my dog would just sit by my side instead of interacting with the other dogs. Please minimize the leash-required areas so that we can continue to enjoy this unique urban park.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 205 **Comment Id:** 350109 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It is important to keep in mind that dogs, especially larger dogs do need quite a bit of space to actually run and hike. This was a point I had some concerns about when reading over the space limitations for off leash areas at Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field. Dogs NEED exercise off leash AND they need to socialize with other dogs off leash in order to remain friendly and healthy.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda S Barcellos **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 227 **Comment Id:** 350148 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: However, the experience of "on-leash" vs. "off-leash" is quite different, both for dogs and their owners. Just as humans and children need space to run around and play and be free, so do dogs. As we know, dogs that get adequate exercise - including time to run off-leash - are happier and healthier dogs, with less behavioral issues. Some of the spaces you propose to change from off-leash to on-leash are marvelous places for dogs and their owners to get exercise and play.

Organization:

Commenter: Danielle Hart **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 233 **Comment Id:** 350162 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It is very important for the health of our dogs (and their people) to have open space to run and play. Dogs who are constantly confined to small areas are the ones that get neurotic. Please let us kep the remaining open off-leash dogg areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Joni Frasson-Sudmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 372 **Comment Id:** 351279 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Restricting off leash areas to designated areas at GGNRA sites essentially creates enclosed dog parks. The impact of all the dog walker's dogs plus individual's dog being confined in smaller areas would be detrimental to both the dogs the owners. Off leash is a necessary method of exercise for dogs. In such a dense city, space is needed for dogs to burn

energy. They would no longer have that freedom if all dogs were packed into the same area. I do not support any restrictions. Having off leash areas for dogs is one of the perks of living in a liberal, amazing city. Its exercise for me my dog! Its necessary for dogs to properly socialize while still having their personal space. A socialized dog is a safe dog. Trying to socialize a dog by tossing it into a small, densly packed area would be dangerous.

Organization:

Commenter: Reilly Andrews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 406 **Comment Id:** 351324 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We are parents, dog-owners, voters and business owners in SF. We are very upset about the proposed changes to off-leash access for dogs. Off-leash access is critical for SAFE well-socialized dogs. For over 20 years, Alternative A has been in place. Leave it be.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 428 **Comment Id:** 351353 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off-Leash Benefits For Dogs: - Socialization - A well socialized dog is a well behaved one! - Exercise - Many popular breeds, such as retrievers and spaniels, require substantial amounts of exercise to be on their best behavior! - Need - Dogs are social animals by nature. To deny them the opportunity to play with other members of their species is to deprive them of a basic need.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1020 **Comment Id:** 351443 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog, and those with which she plays are happier and healthier for being able to romp and play, something they cannot do while on leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard Haas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1038 **Comment Id:** 351468 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I see that so clearly at the Humane Society. After the dogs are cooped up in a cage, we walk them on leash, into a fenced area, designated by the Humane Society, then let them loose, as Mother Nature intended. It is so healing for them to be able to embrace that free-spirited part of them. I so appreciate the opportunity to allow my dogs to run as nature intended, in open space. I can't even imagine it any other way. They run so much faster than I do and I'm pretty fit for a 53 year old. I can't imagine, people less fit, having to keep their dogs on leash at

all times. It can be VERY challenging when they are leashed and just not natural for them.

Organization:

Commenter: Syndee Collison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1072 **Comment Id:** 351526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not restrict any more areas. It's not fair. Dogs need to have places to run and be free. Have negligent owners learn the rules of having off leash dogs. Post signs to be respectful. Issue citations. Offer more dog poop bags. But please please do not restrict any more areas. It will be cruel to owners and dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Michele E Waldman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1086 **Comment Id:** 351536 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I 100% OPOSE these proposed restrictions I have always had a dog. Saying things like "they can play in dog parks" is like holding them prisoner in our beautiful world. Dogs need their exercise. I get MY exercise walking my dog. We MUST do all we can to keep these spaces open. Kids have play grounds&.it is like saying they can only play with in the fences of a playgound. PLEASE&do not limit the space dogs can walk FREELY.

Organization:

Commenter: e gibbs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1102 **Comment Id:** 351643 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs NEED a place to be off leash, in order to be healthy and able to mingle and socialize with other dogs. Ive been here for years and have never heard of complaints from other beach goers, even those without dogs. It is such a special place that allows humans and animals to be free in such a beautiful place!

Organization:

Commenter: Rejean Bourdages **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1105 **Comment Id:** 351648 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my experience, dogs, especially my own, are much more social when off-leash, are much less aggressive, and fight less.

Organization:

Commenter: Paula N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1111 **Comment Id:** 351659 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is important to have space for animals to roam and burn off energy especially when they have to be on leash almost all the rest of the time.
Organization:
Commenter: George Slaiman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1133 **Comment Id:** 351691 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I think it is important for everyone that there are places for dogs to be off leash -when my dog comes home from a day at fort funston he is happy, relaxed and sleepy. Dogs need exercise just like their owners. And they need places that make it an adventure.
Organization:
Commenter: Heather N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 465 **Comment Id:** 351745 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs are hunting animals they have to be able to run outside. If they are kept inside the house all day their instincts will be frustrated. They will become neurotic, and growl and snap at people. They have to have a place to run free.
Organization:
Commenter: Paul H Tieck **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1158 **Comment Id:** 351789 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I think it is a bad idea to restrict off leash access to dogs, especially in large parks like Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Bernal Heights and Mclaren Park. Dogs need and thrive on the freedom to be able to run around off leash. This is when dogs are the happiest and get the most exercise, which is so essential for a dog's well being.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A M N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1196 **Comment Id:** 351959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a senior citizen (81) I have walked my dog at F.F. almost daily since 1980. We as dog owners love F.F. do what we can to keep it safe. I feel if I did not have this place to walk exercise my dog, I would not have reached this age. I have a large dog that need to run fetch balls, at my age there is no way I could exercise him on a leash. Fort Funston has a large community of Senior Citizens who need to be able to walk their dogs off leash. It would be a mistake to limit areas at F.F. You will have more problems from non dog people who will destroy what ever they can.
Organization:

Commenter: Theresa Walker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1198 **Comment Id:** 351960 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are members of peoples families and enjoy being outdoors and running around. It is crucial for their health and well being. Everyone knows that you can not effectively achieve the same level of exercise for the animal with it on the leash - especially true for older folks with dogs. My dog is happiest when running outdoors, playing with other dogs, and rolling in the grass or just observing nature. He deserves this right, as do all dogs.
Organization: none
Commenter: Shawna Levi **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1217 **Comment Id:** 352014 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I feel that when dogs are on the leash they are in fact more territorial, aggressive, and do not demonstrate their instinctive playful and curious attitude toward life.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1234 **Comment Id:** 352041 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Many dogs can't get a proper amount of exercise while tied to a leash, just as many humans wouldn't consider slowly walking to be adequate exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: David Marutiak **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1237 **Comment Id:** 352044 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need to run off-leash. Most weekends we get in a 3-4 mile run at Funston. This exercise is essential to the health and well being of my dogs as well as my health and well being. Walking calmly, on either end of a leash, down the street or through the park is not sufficient as a main source of exercise
Organization:
Commenter: Robert Molyneaux **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1249 **Comment Id:** 352066 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As well, many dog owners claim they need to have their dogs off-leash in order to exercise them. This is not true, as dogs can be exercised just fine on leash.
Organization:

Commenter: David R **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1260 **Comment Id:** 352189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are only allowed on 1% o the GGRA, and with more restrictions on dog friendly trails dog owners would be forced to take dogs to very densely dog populated parks. Dog owners need to spend much more time walking their dogs to get their dogs the exercise they need when on leash.
Organization:
Commenter: monica Tasso **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1267 **Comment Id:** 352198 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs in general tend to be much less aggressive with each other when they are not constrained by a leash. When dogs are leashed they are much more leery since they know they don't have the freedom to move away from a problem or something they do not like.
Organization:
Commenter: Bob Wagner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1275 **Comment Id:** 352217 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My doctor has advised me that this type of steady pace walking is good exercise for my heart condition. Goldie's veterinarian also believes that daily walks in a place where she can socialize off leash with other dogs is also very good for her health. The Key Here is Recreation and they way you want to close off Fort Funston is not right and will ruin the quality of our Experience at Fort Funston
Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1278 **Comment Id:** 352234 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Finally, while most of us have a deep respect for wild life, it is important to honor the presence of their domesticated presence, the dog, by allowing these loving creatures contact with outdoors which benefits their health and temperament as it does our own.
Organization:
Commenter: Marla Schmalle **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1295 **Comment Id:** 352254 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: - will have more dog fight - animal shelters will experience less adoption

Organization:
Commenter: Rico M Tecson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1286 **Comment Id:** 352269 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog also gets much needed exercise by running into the surf and along the sand. It is a joy for me to watch this. It is a joy you will be taking from ME if off leash use is restricted. There are few areas that compare to the beauty and have the fresh air as the ocean areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard D Carrington **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1303 **Comment Id:** 352274 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Taking my dogs to the beach is my biggest passion. It is my hobby as well as my main means of exercise. I'm 47 and my doctor says that my dogs are keeping me in excellent health. My dogs are also emotionally and physically healthy from running off leash and socializing with other dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Marya Taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1304 **Comment Id:** 352277 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean beach and then all of the parks across the bridge is our daily past time and immensely increases the wellbeing of our own lives as well as that of our dog. We rescued a senior dog 2 years ago, and the first time we saw his depression lift was when we discovered how much he loved the waves at Chrissy field. Walking there and in the hills at Funston have without a doubt been the primary source of his healing and continues to be his main joy in life.
Organization:
Commenter: Tiffany A Wade **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1306 **Comment Id:** 352278 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean beach and then all of the parks across the bridge is our daily past time and immensely increases the wellbeing of our own lives as well as that of our dog. We rescued a senior dog 2 years ago, and the first time we saw his depression lift was when we discovered how much he loved the waves at Chrissy field. Walking there and in the hills at Funston have without a doubt been the primary source of his healing and continues to be his main joy in life. Walking around the neighborhood doesn't bring the same gleam to his eye, nor to ours.

Organization:
Commenter: James E Dewald **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1338 **Comment Id:** 352348 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We need this area to remain off-leash area because of the positive and balancing effects that visiting the GGNRA has on us. Living in a city, this space is needed to relax the body and the soul and the dogs need the opportunity to run off leash. Most city dogs, like my dogs, spend most time leashed, and they are of great service to their owners and the community. !!Without the option to let them run off leash on a hour-long walk, working dogs like mine will have to live in non-appropriate living conditions as running off leash on a regular basis is needed to keep them physically and mentally healthy!!
Organization:
Commenter: Julia C Pracht **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1350 **Comment Id:** 352377 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: When we able to have dogs in our home I was excited to take the dogs to the many beautiful areas in San Francisco. This was a great social activity for myself and my dogs. My dogs are over 14 years old now. I have been taking my dogs off-leash several times a week, specifically to the beach and Fort Funston. What I have discovered is that my dogs NEED to be off leash. I can walk them on leash day, after day, but when their paws hit the sand and they can run, they are happy dogs. I am a happy person.
Organization:
Commenter: Michele Gachowski **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1371 **Comment Id:** 352407 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Reducing the areas where dogs are free to be dogs will make it difficult for dog-owners in the Bay Area to exercise their dogs (and themselves), and this will result in (a) overcrowding of existing dog runs in the City parks, and (b) increased dog aggression since they will not be as tired and happy as they currently are.
Organization:
Commenter: Leora Goren **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1374 **Comment Id:** 352411 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As I am sure you are aware, it is very important for a dog's mental and physical health that they get plenty of exercise. Some dog breeds require more exercise than others and it would be difficult for those breeds, such as the Vizsla, to get the proper exercise they require if they cannot run and play off leash. My dogs are very high energy and need to exercise at least

two hours a day. Exercise and socializing is critical to a dog's health and well-being.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1386 **Comment Id:** 352427 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The concept for restricting dogs in fenced in areas where they cannot roam free is part of the enduring folly that just because an animal cannot speak for itself, that its consciousness is inferior. With all due respect to the environment and plant life -which we do love and cherish- Our lives are oppressive enough, we all need to feel free whenever we can. Dogs included.

Organization:

Commenter: anthony kraus **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1388 **Comment Id:** 352428 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It's is proven imperative to dog health for them to be able to run free for a certain amount of time each day. If you under exercise dogs, they become anxious, and dog anxiety is what leads to aggression and has a direct correlation to aggressive attack behavior.

Organization:

Commenter: Lexi Barry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1393 **Comment Id:** 352437 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need to burn off their energy to remain balanced and well-behaved, and sometimes the only way their owners can help them do that is by letting them run off leash. I am not a marathon runner, but my dog is, and she needs more places - not fewer - where she can get proper space to run. If you cut back on off-leash areas in and around the city you will definitely start to see the results in the behavior of the under-exercised, unbalanced dogs who will begin to act out because they will no longer have proper outlets to expend their energy.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1399 **Comment Id:** 352443 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a former SF SPCA employee who ran the mobile adoption department, I am concerned about the future of dog adoptions should there be restrictive off leash areas. People might think twice about adopting a dog if it means they can not have them properly exercised.

Organization: Joan 4 Pets

Commenter: Joan L Mapou **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1402 **Comment Id:** 352499 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It would be an absolute shame if we had no place in the city for him/her to roam free for a little while, because, like people, exercise is very important for a dog's health.
Organization:
Commenter: Josh Obershaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1434 **Comment Id:** 352548 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I visit Fort Funston with my dog Cora every day. She is a great dog and is really only happy and fully exercised when she gets to run around and explore nature and socialize with other dogs
Organization:
Commenter: Ami Barzelay **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1445 **Comment Id:** 352572 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We have two rescue dogs from San Francisco and Oakland Animal Care and Control. Vigorous exercise and off leash play has been an important part in their recovery from a traumatic start and some of the anxiety issues they developed while mistreated by previous owners and time living in city shelters. My family feels strongly that it is important to put our energy into helping local animals recover and integrate into our dense urban community. A big part of this is making sure they are good and tired and well-exercised.
Organization:
Commenter: Carolyn M Hendrickson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1619 **Comment Id:** 352731 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: Given about half of San Francisco residents own dogs, dog owners should be allowed spaces in which to exercise them.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1899 **Comment Id:** 352752 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach as well as many of the fire roads that would be off limits under the proposed plan, where she looks forward each day to being able to run, chase a frisbee and play freely with other dogs. This type of activity is a vital part of my dog's life and physical health.

Organization:
Commenter: Michelle Dodd **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1485 **Comment Id:** 352883 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please reconsider the off leash ban. I am not a dog owner but I have had no issues with off leash dogs in the city and many of my friends have benefited from being able to take their furry companions to large public spaces so they may stretch their legs. Its hard to be a city dog and the freedom to go off leash in large areas is necessary for their happiness.
Organization:
Commenter: Seana L Mickols **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1486 **Comment Id:** 352884 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not restrict dog walking or off leash areas, these areas are so important to our dogs and our community, espcially at crissy field. Dogs need a place to run free, this makes people happier and dogs more relaxed and well behaved when they are walking on the city streets or interacting with humans. it is so important for dogs to get a lot of exercise, and this will become extremely difficult, especially for disabled people or people who can not walk, for their dogs to get enough exercise. Please consider the dogs and the disabled dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: alan l robin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 678 **Comment Id:** 352912 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Changing the dog use rules at GGNRA beaches would negatively impact the quality of our lives for those of us that use the beach regularly, and our dogs lives. I can't tell you how much I value being able to go to the beach daily and find a wild solitude, go running, and get exercise for both myself and my pup. This is such a wonderful and precious aspect of living in San Francisco! Its amazing to have a place where dogs can run, play in the ocean, and be with other four-footed friends in a nature. Without dog access to Ocean Beach I wouldn't want to live in my neighborhood anymore.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah Potenza **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1494 **Comment Id:** 352913 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a dog owner and dog walker, I feel like it's really important to continue to allow dogs to be off leash at Fort Funston and other parks and beaches in and around San Francisco, CA. Off leashing dogs allows them to play fetch and run to get exercise and as long as the dogs are well behaved, this privilege should not be taken away. Banning off leash will force

overcrowding in small fenced dog parks which is not safe and when I walk off leash at the beach I are around other packs to prevent incidents which isn't possible at fenced dog parks. Banning off leash would negatively affect dog owners and the dog walking industry.

Organization: Dog Days by the Bay

Commenter: Laura M Curtin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1503 **Comment Id:** 352930 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not see the need to confine the dogs whose owners are comfortable allowing them off leash. People can usually tell if their dogs are suitable for the leash free environment. I think you can trust the majority of pet owners to be responsible about their animal. The ability for dogs to run around w each other freely is a great thing for pet and owner alike. I do not currently keep any animals, but when I did I was a frequent visitor of dog parks and I believe that was the happiest I ever saw my dogs. Certain breeds are just meant to rove about, and the breeds/individuals that tend to be less social are equally less likely to be put in that situation by their owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Harry Crimm **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1512 **Comment Id:** 352964 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog walkers need to take their animals out daily. We need to socialize them with people and other dogs. It is a loss to society when we have anti-social companions, due to environmental restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Cathryn M Muzaffar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1515 **Comment Id:** 352970 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I will also note that in your environmental impact statement you make no mention to the quality of life for dogs. It is an unfortunate necessity that dogs be leashed sometimes for their safety. But no dog wants to be leashed, nor is it their natural state.

Organization:

Commenter: Ian D Danforth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1516 **Comment Id:** 352972 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog and I love walking, hiking and playing off leash. It allows him the freedom to really sniff, run, play and frolic in a way that he can't when indoors or in my small yard or on leash in on leash areas. It provides him with much needed exercise which, in turn, makes him a well behaved dog. My dog, and many dogs, are better able to socialize with humans

and each other off leash. They are less protective than they are when on leash and my dog is just happier that way. He is very good at listening to my instructions. Many dogs are better behaved off leash and these areas are a precious resource for dogs in the Bay Area. There are already so many restrictions on where dogs can play off leash, please let's keep these areas for off leash fun.

Organization:

Commenter: Leila Samrad **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1518 **Comment Id:** 352975 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need to be able to go off-leash and run free sometimes - and its cruel to spend your whole life sitting, laying, or running on a leash. Have you ever seen the pure joy an animal has when it runs free? I am 100% oposed to this plan.

Organization: ROIworks

Commenter: George Y Revutsky **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1520 **Comment Id:** 352979 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: All these dogs need to be exercised, twice a day. All dogs need off-leash time. Dogs that don't get off-leash play do not get properly socialized, any more than children would who are never allowed out from behind their desks. We need city dogs to be better socialized, not less so. Obviously, dogs do need to be under control. Existing leash laws should be sufficient to achieve this, together with a stronger dog-owner education campaign.

Organization:

Commenter: Rupa Bose **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1522 **Comment Id:** 352994 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are plenty of places out there that do not allow dogs off leash and very few that do. Dogs, just like humans need to run, jump, spin around, and play. Movement is life. Without these activities, life quality and expectancy are drastically reduced. As a student at Life Chiropractic College West, I truly understand the magnitude of this. As a pet parent, we can only do so much on leash for them. My dog is way faster and way more agile than me, so playing with him off leash is the only opportunity he has to be very active.

Organization:

Commenter: Heather Thompson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1523 **Comment Id:** 352998 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And finally, I oppose these new rules because they would cause great hardship to me and my dog. I would have to drive long distances to take my dog to a place where he could get the kind of off leash exercise he needs on a daily basis. Dogs that do not get enough exercise

are problematic but when they are properly exercised they are a benefit to the larger community. Please do not make dogs and their human companions suffer because of your unfair and unnecessary new rules.

Organization:

Commenter: Len Carella **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1531 **Comment Id:** 353020 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We as dog owners use these public places to let them enjoy socializing as much as we humans do. Now granted there are people who are afraid to venture out into the public and choose not to interact socially, but that is their choice. Unfortunately dogs do not. Like young children, dogs need a lot of supervision and attention to nurture a healthy mental and emotional being. Of

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1549 **Comment Id:** 353077 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This policy change is an unacceptable restriction on the lives of dog owners and dog walkers. There are more dogs than children in this city, and they depend on exercise for good behavior just like we do. Eliminating off-leash areas for dogs to run will result in higher bite incidents, more euthanasia of problem animals, and lower mental health for dogs and dog owners alike.

Organization:

Commenter: Gordon Rowe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1551 **Comment Id:** 353089 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash play keeps our dog happy, healthy, and in a calm and relaxed state. She needs it and we need it!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1565 **Comment Id:** 353108 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I want to formally object to the restrictions proposed in the 'preferred alternative' plan. These restrictions would essentially remove all off-leash opportunities, something of great benefit to both dogs and their humans. Dogs with the opportunity to run and socialize are much happier and better behaved. I understand that off-leash areas are hard on the local ecosystem, so I can certainly understand if the city needs to limit access to some areas. But no alternative off-leash areas have been proposed. If the suggested restrictions are put into place,

alternative open spaces must be created and provided.

Organization:

Commenter: Megan Price **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1566 **Comment Id:** 353112 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Why does the GGNRA want to take even MORE space away from where dogs can exercise off-leash? Would the same be true if we were talking about children? The people of Marin have so many dogs - - dogs are a part of life here. I find it unimaginable that the people who live here want LESS places to go to enjoy time hiking, biking, camping, romping, swimming, picnicking, playing frisbee and ball or .....all the activities we enjoy with our dogs. And off-leash play is essential to that mix.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1573 **Comment Id:** 353138 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: if the needs of the dogs are not met and seen, they will become very unhappy. Dogs need space to run, dogs need the free run, not being leashed and restricted, or being in a backyard only. Dogs need the free run and the fun. Dogs on leashes are more aggressive, dogs who do not have adequate socialization and free run are unhappy, Unhappy animals are aggressive

Organization:

Commenter: Bettina N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1579 **Comment Id:** 353145 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe having off leash areas is essential to the development of dogs as well. If all off leash areas are reduced we will likely start seeing even more dogs in shelters with temperament issues due to lack of socialization.

Organization:

Commenter: michael pattersom **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1580 **Comment Id:** 353147 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: That is how it is important to have open dog area's for running and exersize. It's health of our beloved pets we are talking about!

Organization:

Commenter: Gi Stein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1607 **Comment Id:** 353188 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If these restrictive laws were to pass, not only would it affect Shasta's quality of life but it would also affect my family's quality of life. We LOVE the parks and beaches throughout the bay area. I will do everything I can to ensure that my family and dog have the best life as possible. I would even consider moving to a more family oriented place.

Organization:

Commenter: Billy Campbell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1747 **Comment Id:** 353190 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: please consider the negative impact this will have on the lives of pet dogs and their owners. The off-leash policy currently encourages pet dogs and their owners to use the spaces frequently for the enjoyment of nature and for physical exercise. Restrictive changes to this policy will discourage people from using the spaces with regularity and diminish the quality of so many lives.

Organization:

Commenter: Carly Earnshaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2153 **Comment Id:** 353199 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I just can't imagine our pets not getting the exercise they really need and receive from off leash walks. Can you imagine a city full of under exercised dogs and the problems that will cause!

Organization:

Commenter: Debbie Rutledge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1613 **Comment Id:** 353205 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need to be off leash for their health and socialization. No amount of walking replaces a good run. Not to mention the joy these animals bring to all involved in these activities.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah Bertola **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1635 **Comment Id:** 353230 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose this dog management plan. City dogs require the opportunities to run and play like any other dog. A lack of adequate exercise can often lead to behavior problems. Let us have the space to maintain good dog ownership practices.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1636 **Comment Id:** 353232 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And finally, these restrictions will negatively impact my life and the life of my family, including my canine companion. I am a teacher who lives in the city and utilize the GGRNA to exercise and socialize. Limiting access to this facility for canines will limit my ability to keep my dog active and in good health.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2633 **Comment Id:** 353266 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: As a foster family for the Norcal Weimaraner Rescue who walks regularly with our foster dogs in the GGNRA, Im writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRAs new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with our fosters for my own health and our foster dogs health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. We rely on these spaces to help rehabilitate some of our foster dogs. We walked and swam a severely injured Weimaraner named Hero who had been abandoned by his family after being hit by a car. After the initial wounds healed, we took Hero for regular swims at Fort Funston. Hero made a 100% recovery and was later adopted by a police officer.
Organization: Foster home for Norcal Weimaraner Rescue
Commenter: Erin Drake **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3545 **Comment Id:** 353322 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: Think about if you restricted all dogs to the same places how unhealthy that would be for them - - all caged up together.
Organization:
Commenter: Winn C Ellis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1661 **Comment Id:** 353493 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs and humans and children need to be offleash to be healthy and to be mentally in balance.
Organization:
Commenter: Cheis L Jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1666 **Comment Id:** 353502 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please save our off leash doggy play areas. They're important for the well being and ongoing great quality of life we provide our companions here in the Bay Area. When our pups are well exercised when they get to run around instead of walking around. Therefore a busy working owner doesn't have to spend more time walking our dogs due to the fact that we'd be worried that our dogs will tear up the house or even run away due to boredom.

Organization:

Commenter: Cindy T Fung **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1667 **Comment Id:** 353512 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To curtail the ability of owners to take dogs out for walks could result in many pets left in the back yard with little exercise - a cruelty to animals and an injustice to a well-meaning owner.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa Brinkmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1676 **Comment Id:** 353533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need spaces to exercise, and spaces to exercise with their owners provide a wonderful opportunity to keep both happy and healthy. Dogs also, and this is indisputable, love to be with their owners (one look at the face of a forlorn dog left as home while his family piles into the car to head to the beach would certainly convince you of that); take away the spaces we can enjoy with our dogs and you stand to have many unhappy, depressed puppies whining at home.

Organization:

Commenter: Alexandra S Reinsdorf **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1687 **Comment Id:** 353623 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: we rely heavily on the exercise that he receives at local off-leash dog areas for his overall health. Limiting access to local off-leash dog areas would limit my dog's ability to thrive by depriving him of much needed exercise areas, not to mention the family time we (as a family) enjoy while interacting with our dog in these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Thomas R Henry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1691 **Comment Id:** 353643 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Keeping recreational areas off leash for dogs is crucial to their socialization and

exercise. I live in a small one-bedroom apartment with a 65pound dog and rely on these areas to give her the space to run off her energy so that she can be a well-behaved San Francisco citizen. There is no reason to limit or reduce the area that is currently off leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Patrice Speed **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1695 **Comment Id:** 353648 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Well-socialised and well-exercised dogs are happy and healthy dogs, who in turn are well-behaved dogs. My dog is a part of my family, and I take him with me when I go out. Why are we being asked to leave our well-trained and well-behaved dogs at home, rather than taking them out with us so that we all remain healthy?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1698 **Comment Id:** 353652 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need to run for their health and well being.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Ballinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1719 **Comment Id:** 353688 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dogs are both large and require lots of exercise - - running, not walking - - in order to be healthy and well. It is impossible for me to get them that exercise without letting them run off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Mara R Guccione **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1723 **Comment Id:** 353698 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you could see the joy it brings my sweet 15 year old dog, Chloe, when we get to go to crissy field. She has bad arthritis and walking stairs in impossible for her, but at the beach, she is able to walk from the car (which I lift her in and out of) straight to the water. There she is able to get some relief from her pain and enjoy getting out and socializing with other dogs and people. I simply can not deny her this joy at her late stage in life because of a poorly written and unscientific law that singles out and targets one group of people.

Organization:

Commenter: Lindsay Dellas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1731 **Comment Id:** 353709 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need to run and play. This creates healthy non-neurotic dogs that are easy to be around. Leashing dogs makes them aggressive and territorial.

Organization:

Commenter: CHARLENE S Frischer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1749 **Comment Id:** 353733 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many of our customers go to Funston and Crissy Fields every day, and most of those dogs REQUIRE a lot of daily exercise that is unrealistic for a modern dog owner to compete with - - we simply can't keep up with them, jogging isn't always an option, and hiring a dog walker instead of participating in bonding playtime at a local beach or park is just an obnoxious idea.

Organization: K9 Scrub Club

Commenter: Christina S Valence **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1772 **Comment Id:** 353757 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: City dogs need a place to play. Don't take that from us. By taking away Funston and requiring leashes at more city parks, you would turn my dog into a cooped up, moody, bored member of society rather than the happy, positive participant that she is.

Organization:

Commenter: felicia N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 936 **Comment Id:** 353793 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The benefits of having open space (and especially on beaches like Ft. Funston and Crissy Field) available to off leash dogs is critical. Dogs, and especially medium to large dogs, need that kind of open space exercise; they do not get it from on leash walking or off leash in tiny enclosures. Dogs that do not get sufficient exercise can potentially become more dangerous, quite frankly.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicole Grindle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1792 **Comment Id:** 353876 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However, I would argue that these off leash areas serve humans as much as their pets. Outdoor exercised pets are happier pets, especially in a crowded city like San Francisco. This is important.

Organization:
Commenter: Susan Cunningham **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1793 **Comment Id:** 353881 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not restrict off-leash privileges in the GGNRA. It will have a significant impact on these animals' well-being.
Organization:
Commenter: kathryn m weeks **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1795 **Comment Id:** 353926 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We pay the ridiculous costs of living in SF to have access to special places like Fort Funston, and we cannot afford to lose the off-leash privileges that make them so unique. It will have a significant impact on our animals' well-being.
Organization:
Commenter: kathryn m weeks **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1796 **Comment Id:** 353930 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Just providing food and shelter for our pets is not enough to ensure good health. Environmental enrichment, training, socialization and daily exercise are essential for our pets to be fit and healthy. Dogs need regular off leash exercise that often can not be provided in our homes, ours small backyards if any, or by simply leash walking in the neighborhood or at local parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Sheryl R Owyang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1797 **Comment Id:** 353949 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off-leash spaces in the San Francisco Bay Area are extremely important to dogs and dog owners. They increase the happiness and well being of both. When dogs cannot get significant exercise, as they do with fetch (off leash), they are much harder to manage at home and in general. A well exercised dog is a wonderful dog for the whole community. Please do not limit off-leash dog areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Laura Klivans **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1814 **Comment Id:** 354138 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is incredibly important to both my health and the health of my dog to be able to exercise in our beautiful outdoor parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Page Bertelsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1823 **Comment Id:** 354260 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: ALL ANIMALS INCLUDING HUMANS DESERVE AND NEED FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT. HUMANS ARE ABLE TO WALK AND EXERCISE FREELY AND ANIMALS NEED TO BE ABLE TO DO THIS AS WELL FOR THEIR HEALTH AND WELL-BEING. IF AN ANIMAL CANNOT MOVE FREELY FROM TIME TO TIME, THEY ARE NOT LIVING A FULL LIFE

Organization:

Commenter: philis bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1828 **Comment Id:** 354271 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed restrictions in GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan are severe, unwarranted, and oppressive to all responsible and law abiding dog owners and their pets. If implemented, these restrictions will severely compromise our ability to provide the necessary care to our pets. Any dog behaviorist will tell you that well socialized dogs are also critical for the safety of other people and animals as positive socialization mitigates fear based reactions. This is a health and safety issue for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: Wade Crosson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1829 **Comment Id:** 354275 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: a dog that doesn't receive proper exercise can become a mean dog and you'll see more problems down the road. when you hear a dog barking non stop at home or being rough in the world is most likely that way because they don't get proper exercise and dogs physically need to run.

Organization:

Commenter: sheila bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1835 **Comment Id:** 354309 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Fort Funston area is a key place and one of only a few I know of where dogs can be dogs - off leash. They can run on the beach, interact with other dogs, and feel free for a time. It is truly a sight to see your dog as happy as a dog can be, and currently they can be that at Fort Funston. This also keeps their owners fit and healthy, happy and calm. With what

dogs face these days, so many being euthanized that don't have the luxury of homes and owners that care, let's not take one more thing away from them.

Organization:

Commenter: Nathan L Hanley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1860 **Comment Id:** 354386 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Removing off leash areas like this or restricting them will prevent many people from learning how to manage their dogs, and from their dogs to learn from each other. At the same time, why don't they just remove playgrounds?

Organization:

Commenter: Priya Sumal **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1865 **Comment Id:** 354392 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Members of our Ridgeback family organize and participate in Ridgeback "meet-ups" at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, and Muir Beach. These off leash meet-ups encourage the dog socialization which is necessary in high density urban areas.

Organization: Diablo Rhodesian Ridgebacks

Commenter: Nancy A Faville **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1870 **Comment Id:** 354409 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is absurd to me that the off-leash dog areas even need to be defended. Dogs, like people, are social animals even & especially in domestic urban circumstances, and they require, NEED adequate play/excercise, energy & interaction outlets with their owners & other dogs. This is NOT something new! Dogs are animals and need to be able to express their energies & instincts as such and this cannot be achieved by denying them & their guardians reasonable access to areas where the limitations & restrictions of leashes & leashed activity are not required.

Organization:

Commenter: Mark Rubnitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1893 **Comment Id:** 354482 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a professional dog behaviorist and trainer who's lived and worked in San Francisco for over 15 years, I know from experience how important these areas are for our dogs' and people's health and well being. Dogs need to be able to run and play in large spaces and even trained in these spaces. Without proper exercise and training, almost all dogs will exhibit behavior issues. These behavior problems can be as minor as destruction of household items and mild separation anxiety to dangerous aggression towards other dogs and humans.

Organization:
Commenter: Beverly Ulbrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1913 **Comment Id:** 354531 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs really can't get enough exercise at the end of a leash - it's a physiological fact.
Organization:
Commenter: dee clark **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1915 **Comment Id:** 354539 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs, big and small, need ways to let their energy out and they also need regular exercise and socialization to have a healthy balance of lifestyles.
Organization:
Commenter: Dog Owner N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1916 **Comment Id:** 354541 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need to socialize. Dogs need to release energy. Failure to have the ability to do so results in behavior issues. Walking on a 6 foot leash doesn't always work to take care of exercise. Dog parks aren't always the answer either.
Organization:
Commenter: Jean M Bready **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1922 **Comment Id:** 354558 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Leashed nature walking and off-leash play provide essential exercise for dogs, which is particularly important with the rise of canine obesity.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1923 **Comment Id:** 354560 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are very few areas in the city and surrounding bay area where dogs can run freely with their families. The loss of this space results in anxious dogs that aren't well exercised and therefore bark and cause complaints with neighbors. It's healthier for all involved if dogs and there families have a lot of outdoor space to run and play.
Organization:
Commenter: Mara Fazio **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1924 **Comment Id:** 354561 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: So many dogs are EUTHANIZED annually for BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS. dogs need to run & have energy burned off to be good dogs not ripping up the furniture at home.
Organization:
Commenter: Marlene Price **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1940 **Comment Id:** 354582 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I also feel it is VERY important for RUBY to have some freedom and joy to run around and socialize.
Organization:
Commenter: Kim J Holmes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1952 **Comment Id:** 354607 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Because we live in the city, off-leash areas are critical to the happiness & health (emotional & physical) of both my dog and all the dogs in the area.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne F Schnobrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1985 **Comment Id:** 354647 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are better behaved off-leash than on and their log-term behavior is better as well.
Organization:
Commenter: Kristin Hagan Sprincin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2656 **Comment Id:** 354799 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: San Mateo County will have no off leash sites if this plan goes through. That is tragic for both the dogs under our care and the humans who walk them. I myself have a Bouvier who is a service dog as well as a pet. He requires a lot of exercise and if there are no off leash sites I would have a difficult time managing the 35-60 minutes of intense exercise per day that he requires.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia Dailey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2657 **Comment Id:** 354808 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you have a large population of dogs that are not allowed to be a true dog and enjoy this open space, you will have a large population of extremely frustrated dogs that could lead to aggressive behavioral problems.

Organization:

Commenter: Jami M Nadzam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2658 **Comment Id:** 354818 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: You will have more dogs in the pounds as people cant find a place to walk them.

Organization:

Commenter: Carolyn Erdman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2879 **Comment Id:** 354893 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan, because the very few off-leash areas in San Francisco provide an area for our dogs to get exercise and to work freely with trainers. Without these areas, I would worry that my dog wouldn't get enough exercise, because we live in a city apartment without a yard, and this would have an impact on his health

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Emly Perlman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2883 **Comment Id:** 354905 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you've ever owned a dog, you know that at minimum they need to be exercised 30 minutes two times a day to avoid separation anxiety, destruction to rental property, weight gain, depression and other health issues. A dog that remains indoors and with no exercise is a dog that an owner will quickly be com e unable to manage and maintain ownership of.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Alita Macias **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2886 **Comment Id:** 354929 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And finally, there are so few places that are off-lease dog friendly within San Francisco. My dog is very high energy and loves to run on open stretches like Fort Funston. Without these special places, he and I will not get the exercise we need and love.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Lauren Bagden **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2887 **Comment Id:** 354930 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because pets need to excercise and people have small yards/apartments who have pets but no room. if you ban pets from parks some people will have no fun and not go to parks
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: thomas zhou **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2890 **Comment Id:** 355022 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because my dog uses off-leash trails 3 times a week and would be confined to a very small beach if this goes through. Reducing the area she has to play puts her at greater risk for being attacked by another dog. My neighbor's dog was recently killed by another dog in a small dog park. I feel this could have been prevented if the dogs had more room to play.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Sarah Fruy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2898 **Comment Id:** 355177 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it proposes taking away yet another freedom and puts the health and happiness of dogs in jeopardy.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Kathleen Hughes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2903 **Comment Id:** 355189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there are thousands and thousands of us who walk our dogs every day to stay healthy & fit, with our dogs safely under control - dogs can & need to run around and walk way way further than humans - they NEED to be able to run around while we walk
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Janet Standen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2907 **Comment Id:** 355198 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog

Management Plan because...I walk/run my dog on the beach at Ocean Beach & Crissy Fields, sometimes Muir Beach on each and every weekend. 3 days/week, my dog is picked up by a great dog walker who takes her with other dogs to play and hike at Ft. Funston. She is such a healthy active dog, if she only was allowed to go out on a leash, it would KILL HER SPIRIT!! This

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jill Hutchinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2910 **Comment Id:** 355201 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred a.lter.native described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent people like myself from recreating with our dogs for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Kristin Kelly **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2924 **Comment Id:** 355216 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mental and physical health requires being able to run and play for all creatures. I have walked me dog in SF for years and the only trouble I ever had was when a pit bull escaped their house and attacked my dog on the sidewalk. Make it a requirement that only socialized dogs can run free if you must make new rules.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Louisa Suta **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2928 **Comment Id:** 355225 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Franciscans love our dogs, but it's hard for dogs to get enough exercise in a city. Vast off-leash areas are necessary for many dogs, including mine, to get the exercise they (and their human friends) so desperately need! When my sweet sheltie mix does not get sufficient exercise (and multiple on-leash walks per day are not enough, nor are trips to the tiny fenced in dog runs) she be com es a nervous wreck, and she begins annoyance behaviors such as barking.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Adryon Burton Denmark **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2929 **Comment Id:** 355227 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for the past 8

years.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Peter Olfe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2937 **Comment Id:** 355241 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are being blamed right and left for human deficiencies, if this space is not open to them the impact on their innocent little lives will be far greater than the impact they ever had on the GGNRA every was.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Alexis Pontecorvo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2941 **Comment Id:** 355246 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog needs exercise, not just a walk, and the need to socialize with others of his species. Necessary for health and fitness.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Richard Sawransky **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2942 **Comment Id:** 355247 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. Dogs need exercise to be healthy, and are allowed now to run free in only a miniscule fraction of GGNRA lands.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Greg Priest **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2944 **Comment Id:** 355251 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...dogs need a good, full out run to keep their muscles toned. Mine are good citizens and reliable on voice control. There are very few spaces in our county (San Mateo) where dogs can be legally off leash.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Sharon C Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2968 **Comment Id:** 355282 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: He is a water dog, and needs to swim. This plan will make it nearly impossible for my dog to swim and will make other city dog parks over crowded. This is unfair and u net

hical!
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Britt Fohrman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2983 **Comment Id:** 355311 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Out of door recreation is important to the health and well-being of dogs, and the proposed Dog Management Plan limits access too severely.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Margaret Pearce **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2998 **Comment Id:** 355337 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I think we have a duty to these beautiful animals that provide us with so much. I think it is unfair to except these com panions to spend their life on 6 feet of leash.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Robert Brownell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3005 **Comment Id:** 355345 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because my dogs need to run faster than I can to stay in shape! There is plenty of land for conservation and off-leash use.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Patricia Jarvis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3009 **Comment Id:** 355351 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is really important for urban areas to provide off leash dog areas for their citizens. Dogs need to run off leash, and for responsible dog owners an off leash walk is their most vital and frequent access to trails and recreation areas.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Sophia Vicent **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3013 **Comment Id:** 355354 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...there is already limited space for dogs to roam free and socialize and

they and their owners both need this to be happy and healthy. There is a calming and centering that the dogs receive when they have open space to socialize and this makes for a well-adjusted animal.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Michael Manibusan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3018 **Comment Id:** 355364 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because having these off-leash dog parks are incredibly important to the well-being of our beloved pets, and ourselves.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Rowena Seto **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3026 **Comment Id:** 355377 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog goes every day to enjoy one of the GGNRA parks and needs this to promote a healthy life. Offering these areas for pets promotes a healthy lifestyle for myself, my family, and my dog and allows us to get out to enjoy the preserved nature that surrounds San Francisco.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: jennifer ho **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3128 **Comment Id:** 355387 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash dog play is crucial to my dog's health and socialization and walking freely in these areas allows me to enjoy them for exactly what they are intended for: recreation.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Helen Cleary **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3129 **Comment Id:** 355390 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... people and their dogs need a safe place to exercise and socialize. Besides the obvious health benefits of outdoor exercise, these areas help bring people together, a chance to know their neighbors and feel connected to their com munity by sharing a simple and natural com mon interest.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Rebecca Cubba **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3130 **Comment Id:** 355391 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The dog-friendly off-leash areas in and around San Francisco are very valuable and widely used. Please do not shut them down! I'm not even a dog owner and I enjoy going to these locations with friends and their dogs! It's crucial for my friends' health and the health of their animals to get this fresh air and exercise while living in such a dense urban environment.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Carly Jefferson-Dow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3647 **Comment Id:** 355392 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the health and wellbeing of countless dog owners and their dogs depend on these places for exercise, socialization, and exquisite recreation.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: molly mitchell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3651 **Comment Id:** 355395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our pets need a place to run free off leash-.-.it's imperative for their health. Also, at a time when the country is facing a public health (obesity) crisis, our government entities should not be erecting barriers that make exercise less accessible.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Alexis Petrakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3678 **Comment Id:** 355597 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because we are in great need of open space for our dogs and all the dog owners. This is what makes living in San Francisco so special, the beautiful open space available to explore with our family and friends. Our dog's are part of our family. They deserve fun, time to run, open space to feel free and happy.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Summer Andreasen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3682 **Comment Id:** 355601 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I have a dog that should enjoy not being on a leash all day. That's torture to an animal, especially in a city with no backyards for dogs to run around in

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Cathy Tennes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3690 **Comment Id:** 355606 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: All the dog owner will then go to other areas and overcrowd those parks with their dogs. Having these area for me and my dog keeps me happy, sane and rejuvenated. If a majority of the dogs in SF had to start using the sidewalks as bathroom and be on leashes walking around the block I don't think this will be an appealing city to live in. It also may create new behaviors in dogs that will have a negative effect.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Renee Naleppa **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3739 **Comment Id:** 355611 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is cruel to keep dogs in apartments and on leash their entire lives!!! People and pets which make us happy, healthy, productive and responsible should live in harmony!
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Christine Federico **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3890 **Comment Id:** 355636 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Take away this right and you will have animals with pent-up energy and aggression-.-.in other words, creating a new problem!
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Adrianne Bee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3891 **Comment Id:** 355637 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the exclusion of dogs in parks doesn't make any sense. There is so much com munity provided by dogs; allowing everyone to cross borders and relate in authentic way. Effectively sterilizing parks will have a negative effect on both dogs and humans.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: lisa maley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3893 **Comment Id:** 355642 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog needs space to run just like humans do, it would make the already very crowded city parks even more crowded!

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: daniela jagle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3894 **Comment Id:** 355643 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...dogs need space just like humans. We must protect our and animals ability to move freely and have open space.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Christine Harris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3905 **Comment Id:** 355656 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it's unnecessary, and because it's cruel and detrimental to the health of dogs to not be able to run around.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jon Richardson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3907 **Comment Id:** 355658 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...my kids and family dog walk fort funston daily, it's our exercise. our dog would be lost without it.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Aisling Hennessy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3911 **Comment Id:** 355666 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...there are so many restrictions already and my dog needs a place to play. How can a dog play/exercise on a leash - he cannot. Please don't make us keep our dogs on leash.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Nicole DeMeo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2098 **Comment Id:** 355690 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Keeping dogs ON leash all the time creates many new problems for our society - - it creates behavior problems in dogs that are very serious and result in many injuries every year to HUMAN BEINGS. Dogs need to run free - - and they have done that for many centuries along the coast as they were the domesticated friends of Native Americans. To keep them on leash is animal abuse - - does the GGNRA really believe that there is NO coastal areas where dogs and their owners can hike and play off leash? That is insultingly stupid.

Organization:

Commenter: Tom Murphy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4169 **Comment Id:** 355751 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRAI) because there are very limited areas that we can let our pets run free. We have enough out of shape obese people in this country. We don't need the same for our dogs.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Mike Swart **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4170 **Comment Id:** 355935 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...healthy animals need a space to run and play and to get out of the confines of apartments, further, there are more dogs than children in the city and they are an integral part of many of our family lives...so stand up for healthy animals..

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: donald bruce **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4180 **Comment Id:** 355949 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because: Dogs. our family members and an important part of our life are just like us, the people; they are also alive and need spaces to exercise freely. If you don't want to be leashed all day long without any freedom so don't the dogs. So please allow them some freedom in our human world.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Eric Sun **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4183 **Comment Id:** 355951 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because decreasing available space for dogs to exercise and play together off-leash is a very bad idea. Dogs are not only man's best friend but they fulfill a critical need for

many people in terms of com panionship and support. But dogs need the opportunity to socialize and exercise that can only be met by access to off-leash exercise areas.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Sean McKenna **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4188 **Comment Id:** 355958 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it is necessary for dogs to have a place to exercise and run free without a leash. A well exercised dog is a well behaved dog. I do Animal Assisted Therapy with my dog and there are no words to describe the joy that he brings to client and patients all over the City. With proper exercise he does his best work.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Lynda Locke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4191 **Comment Id:** 355962 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We need to promote pet ownership for our mental and physical health, especially those of us living in cities. Dogs, in particular, promote our physical health by taking us for frequent walks. But a dog really cannot get enough exercise to be healthy if it is at the end of a tether.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Timothy Covington **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4198 **Comment Id:** 355974 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because having open areas for dogs improves the health of owners and canines as well as reducing behavior problems through exercise and support from other experienced dog owners. On any given day there is a com munity of many dozens of people available for friendship and exchange of knowledge. Urban dog parks don't offer the space or exercise opportunities available here.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Katrina Wreede **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4203 **Comment Id:** 355976 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because taking my dog to Ocean Beach every weekend for the past 4 years have brought me and Sumo such pleasure and allows him to run, off leash and get the exercise he needs, especially when I am working full time Monday - Friday.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Jennifer Dusiewicz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4204 **Comment Id:** 355977 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... my pug loves to run on the beach! It's unfair to keep pets leashed, they need their exercise too!
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: katelin moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4206 **Comment Id:** 355979 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because in San Francisco more people own pets than have kids. It is vitally important for the health of the com munity to have off-leash dog areas. Both non-dog owners as well as dog owners benefit from having healthy dogs who are well socialized in the com munity.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Dori Melton **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4454 **Comment Id:** 355989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because. Dogs and humans need exercise. Its just a few people who oppose dogs. And just very small minority of dog owners who cause some trouble. Please don't restrict our lives any further than it is already.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Caspar Willems **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4458 **Comment Id:** 355994 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Personally, I take my dog every weekend to Ft. Funston. It's good for him because he expends energy and socializes with other dogs and people. It's good for me because I exercise and unwind.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Melanie Rafaty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4461 **Comment Id:** 355996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog

Management Plan because it is exclusive and discriminative towards these animals. A drastic 90% dcrease in recreation space available greatly affects the well-being of both animals and owners.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Hillary Acer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4473 **Comment Id:** 356009 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA Plan imposes unreasonable restrictions which will have a very negative impact on the quality of life for people AND dogs!

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Theresa Gaydon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5365 **Comment Id:** 356025 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because we were at Ft. Funston Saturday with 2 families and 5 kids and 2 dogs. We wouldn't have been there if it weren't for the dogs because they need to get out every day. But we adults need to get out too. The kids definitely need to get out or they'd be inside and play video games. It benefits us all.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Bradley Charbonneau **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2607 **Comment Id:** 356868 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: With only 1% o GGNRA lands dedicated to off-leash access, further restricting off-leash access can only offer small (if any) gains versus the enormous impact to the 10,000 dog visitors per day, the health of dog owners whose primary exercise is walking their dogs, and the subsequent overcrowding of city dog areas, insufficient dog exercise and socialization which will lead to further overcrowding of abandoned dog shelters

Organization:

Commenter: art gallagher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2615 **Comment Id:** 356882 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who lives in the city of San Francisco and walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:
Commenter: Adam French **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2618 **Comment Id:** 356911 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dogs need exercise, they need to run around, and it is inhumane not to let the dogs on the beach.
Organization:
Commenter: Eric t Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2629 **Comment Id:** 356936 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It would be cruel to my dog if she were unable to exercise and I have used Fort Fungston for her and my previous dog (I had her for 13 yeras).
Organization:
Commenter: John A Abbott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2637 **Comment Id:** 356956 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: What's the problem with dogs being allowed to run on the beaches? I understand that it is manditory if the dog goes to the bathroom the owner is supposed to pick it up. I do know some don't do that but with all the uproar of cruelty to animals, I would think this is being cruel. It is depriving them of their freedom to run and get their exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2647 **Comment Id:** 356986 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA (specifically Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara), I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on this property for many, many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Deborah Mortensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2666 **Comment Id:** 357012 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: being able to take our dog with us into parks off leash is crucial to his health. We live in a small apartment and it wouldn't be a healthy environment if we couldn't take him on

long hikes, runs and walks off leash in the parks and open spaces.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer A Bossin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2667 **Comment Id:** 357013 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is important that dogs get enough exercise & expel their energy, so that they are tired in the evenings and don't cause havoc indoors.
Organization:
Commenter: Annie Kim **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2667 **Comment Id:** 357014 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: From Crissy Field to Fort Funston to Alamo Square, these places not only offer dogs a ton of exercise after being cooped up in an apartment all day, but it is at those places that they learning how to behave & play with other dogs and mind people.
Organization:
Commenter: Annie Kim **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2671 **Comment Id:** 357026 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The PA would significantly and adversely impact the way we have been using GGNRA areas for both fun and health, for all three of us, for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Steven Armstrong **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2694 **Comment Id:** 357087 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is as crucial for my dog to be able to go and run as it is for myself. I cannot think of a better place to exercise my companion than the open spaces and beach. I feel allowing a dog to run keeps them fit, happy and well balanced.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2703 **Comment Id:** 357115 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Every Saturday and Sunday of each week I take my dog PJ to Chrissy field to run, swim and play with me and other dogs and get good and tired to boot. I feel that these outings are as beneficial to him as they are me.
Organization:

Commenter: Lisa J Davidson Wissink **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2710 **Comment Id:** 357123 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Goldie and I socialize with other Dog Walkers and their Dogs which besides the social benefits, this makes for a mellow, less aggressive dog... More importantly the dogs like Goldie who are rescued instead of being executed because of the large amount of dogs that come out of puppy mills . Of these puppies, as many as 64% oe dogs two and under are surrendered to The Pound. The Pound and Dog Rescue Groups are the last hope of placing these dogs who breathe and smell the same air as us and have their own personality's; they have feelings of Joy/Happiness and sadness which makes them a Family Member.
Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2715 **Comment Id:** 357130 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: They need to be able to run as well as walk. We take them to The dog side of Stinson Beach, Chrissy Field and Rodeo Beach so that they can run off leash. . When we hike with them we have them on leash. Please keep those areas open for dogs off lease. Dogs that do not get enough exercise become restless.
Organization:
Commenter: Nora A Contini **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2718 **Comment Id:** 357132 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The ability to run the dog not only helps her, but is important to insure she is calm in her encounters throughout the day.
Organization:
Commenter: Roberto Esteves **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2732 **Comment Id:** 357151 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Douglas Bentz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2743 **Comment Id:** 357160 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It's my understanding that you're considering closing Ft. Funston and other parks to off-leash dog walking. They are some of the few places left to walk dogs off-leash and really let them have a good time. I use these facilities often and it would really impact my family and my dog if they were made on-leash places.

Organization:

Commenter: Rob Sherwood **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2753 **Comment Id:** 357194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For many local dog guardians, especially seniors and others who find it difficult exercise their pets while on-leash, the GGNRA is the only place where they can let their dogs play and release a lot of energy. As the SF SPCA can attest, daily exercise is essential to a dog's proper health and well-being. Exercise affects a dog's behavior, trainability and aggression levels, which are important to properly maintaining public safety in crowded urban environments. Take away off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA, and dog guardians may be unable to meet the physical and mental needs of their pets (also at a detriment to their own healthy, active lifestyles).

Organization: San Francisco SPCA

Commenter: Brandy Kuentzel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2272 **Comment Id:** 357292 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Before anyone decides to take away the rights of off leash dog walking, someone needs to consult with the behavior problem which will develop when animals (and people) are made to live on ropes. Animal behavior specialist should be consulted before we create negative impact by restricting socialization of dogs and humans alike in this area.

Organization: Marrvelous Films

Commenter: David Marr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2765 **Comment Id:** 357388 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I live at Ocean Beach in San Francisco, and I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Jacob K Lesnik **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2770 **Comment Id:** 357416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a proud long-time San Francisco resident and someone who walks regularly with my dog at Ocean Beach, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is shortsighted, restrictive, and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and the health of my community the way I have on GGNRA properties for over ten years.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2771 **Comment Id:** 357422 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When I adopted my dog from the San Francisco SPCA, I made a commitment to provide a better life for him. Crucial to this is being able to give him adequate exercise and play in the areas where I live. This exercise is also important in increasing the health and well being of dog owners themselves.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2773 **Comment Id:** 357432 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, his dog walker, who is also a Richmond resident, takes him and his pals to Fort Funston every week for additional exercise and socialization. Without this off-leash access to this park, he would lose opportunities to get his energy out and explore the outdoors while we're away at work.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Ruch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2783 **Comment Id:** 357447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed GGNRA restrictions on off leash dog walking will have a severe impact on my dogs and the health and happiness of my pets and my family.

Organization:

Commenter: alison lufkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357472 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If it were not for my dog, I would not get out and get this exercise nor would my dog. These are the only places in the Bay Area where we can run, play ball, splash in the ocean. The NPS changes will seriously impact the physical and mental health of countless people and their pets as well as the livelihoods of those who make their livings working with dogs outdoors.

Organization: Dog City Tours

Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2801 **Comment Id:** 357510 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need freedom to run around in a safe space and they can not get the same exercise on a leash walk.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2802 **Comment Id:** 357520 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: He is very well behaved and walks well on a leash. But it's great for him to regularly get off leash to run and play with both me and other dogs. A good hour or so of off-leash play allows Redgy to work out all his energy. By the time we get home, he is exhausted and can just sit, relax and nap beside me.
Organization:
Commenter: Joyce Q **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2805 **Comment Id:** 357523 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the GGNRA dog management plan. I have been taking my voice controlled dog/s throughout the area for 15 years, always with a leash and baggie in hand. It's crucial for a dog's health that they have a chance to interact with the wild environment that GGNRA has set aside and is threatening to eliminate.
Organization: McEver Design
Commenter: Caroline McEver **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2808 **Comment Id:** 357528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We enjoy taking our dog the off leash to join other dogs in play. Without these options I worry his health as well as ours will be impacted by limiing play in off leash areas to small areas and with the potential for overcrowding
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2812 **Comment Id:** 357543 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs and Dog Owners for decades have had the right to walk and run our dogs in these areas and eliminating over 90% oit is inhumane and ill-conceived.
Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Meyers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2818 **Comment Id:** 357551 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrea B **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2833 **Comment Id:** 357590 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please help us keep the open areas for dog available , the little freedom we are able to offer to them is very important to keep healthy pets. Dogs love to run free, and they deserve that opportunity. Please don't take it away
Organization:
Commenter: Karen C Pinto **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2837 **Comment Id:** 357605 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog is a rescue dog with a lot of anxiety. And the two best things for a dog with anxiety are exercise and wide open spaces. I cannot take my dog to enclosed dog parks. The space is too small and he is too anxious. Therefore, I am not able to use any fenced-in area designated for dogs in the city or out. If the open trails and beaches in the GGNRA are closed for off-leash dog use I will have nowhere to take my dog that is near the city and safe for us to exercise and socialize off-leash. This would make his quality of life so much poorer and that is just unfair when there is so much land available for multiple use and the vast majority of dog owners are so respectful and responsible when it comes to their environment.
Organization:
Commenter: Brandi D **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2847 **Comment Id:** 357622 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog knows he's near Fort Funston just by smelling the ocean air, I've never seen him more excited. Please don't take away this free roam sanctuary for our dogs. It would greatly diminish the quality of life for dogs who frequent the area.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher Nelson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2849 **Comment Id:** 357625 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have asked myself as a human how would it feel to live in a world where everywhere I went I had to be on a leash. I realize dogs are domesticated animals, but they still need freedom.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2852 **Comment Id:** 357638 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Many dogs are more stable and peaceful off leash. Allowing dogs to really run makes them healthier animals
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2859 **Comment Id:** 357676 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have a companion dog who is the love of my life. I pay a friend to walk the dog in various parts of Marin County including Tennessee Valley, Muir Beach and Rodeo Beach. I cannot walk the dog or allow him off-leash, so knowing he's getting this kind of active exercise is such a blessing to me. He sleeps better and i sleep better after these outings. It's common sense that dogs need exercise and being off-leash is so very helpful with their development and socialization. Having this ability to get my dog exercise is so important to both of us.
Organization:
Commenter: betty Meyers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2860 **Comment Id:** 357678 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash dog play is crucial to my dog's health and socialization and walking freely in these areas allows me to enjoy them for exactly what they are intended for: recreation.
Organization:
Commenter: Helen N Cleary **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2861 **Comment Id:** 357680 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am very disappointed in how the GGNRA is planning on handling dog access and off-leash access on land GGNRA has been hired to manage FOR the people of the Bay Area. This is a fighting point for responsible dog owners who realize and understand that having a dog is a right and to have a happy, balance dog requires varied places to walk, run, and play with them not on leash.
Organization:

Commenter: Natasha A Applegate **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2866 **Comment Id:** 357688 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a senior citizen and I attribute my relative good health to the fact that I walk with my dog at least twice a day every day. It keeps both me and my dog in excellent shape, both physically and mentally. It is a known fact that a well-exercised and socialized dog is a good dog, one that is friendly toward people and other dogs. A dog constantly kept on leash is not a well exercised dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrew J Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2876 **Comment Id:** 357707 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking my dog in the GGNRC is healthy not only for me, but also my dog. I have never had a problem in doing so.
Organization:
Commenter: Alex Milo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3029 **Comment Id:** 357721 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I never realized how important happy dogs are to their owners or how important exercise is to maintain the happiness of the dog.
Organization:
Commenter: molly c mitchell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3033 **Comment Id:** 357744 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need people and people need dogs. For both to be happy, dogs need to run and be free to play! Watching this in my everyday life brings joy to me and my hundreds of dog friends community I've built through the years.
Organization:
Commenter: Annie Sammis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3039 **Comment Id:** 357757 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash dog sites such as Fort Funston and Chrissy Fields keep BOTH dogs and humans healthy and happy. There has to be a better way.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3046 **Comment Id:** 357768 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs, like people, need to feel and experience the beauty and the freedom of nature. There is nothing like a dog running on a beach or the happiness of a dog picking up smells along their walk. I feel as though it makes for a better, balanced and happier dog overall, just as it does for people. I also believe that a happy dog is a less threatening or anxious dog.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3051 **Comment Id:** 357792 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Lots of families enjoy taking dogs out for walks and if off-leash gets banned then most dogs would probably be depressed having to stay inside most or all the time. Most dogs wouldn't even be able to have fun while playing fetch or running around with owners and it would be heartbroken since dogs wouldn't be able to get the exercise it would get running around without a leash. Dogs don't have voices like we do so they cant speak up for themselves but i think that they would be very frustrated if they can't run around or play anymore so please do not ban off leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Bac Hoang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3054 **Comment Id:** 357822 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please don't reduce the amount of space that our dogs have to play in! My dog gets much better exercise and socialization when she is off-leash, and it is delightful to watch dogs playing together. It is a shame that we are eliminating dog access in our parks. Please don't reduce my dog's access to off-leash areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Connie Adachi **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3056 **Comment Id:** 357828 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please keep off leash areas open for dogs to roam and play. Dogs need to socialize to be good citizen canines. Off leash socialization for dogs has been proven to benefit the animal and society
Organization:
Commenter: Tom Jakaby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3060 **Comment Id:** 357845 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To be healthy, dogs need to be able to exercise freely in open space. The need to be able to run, which requires off leash space. This is a quality of life issue for the dogs, but also for human SF residents who own dogs. Off leash park areas are a necessity for the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Cassandra E Fritzen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3062 **Comment Id:** 357854 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: All you are doing is contributing to making it even harder to have a dog. Result is overcrowded shelters because people cant be bothered. And sadly the dogs are the ones that ultimately pay the price.

Organization:

Commenter: Fabienne Mezei **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3072 **Comment Id:** 357882 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As the owner of a dog who requires extensive amounts of exercise, but yet is well trained and obedient, I find the potentially limiting leash laws to be not only inconvenient, but also concerning for my pet's health. I simply cannot run long or fast enough to properly exercise my dog, and stricter leash laws will lead to frustration for both my canine and myself.

Organization:

Commenter: Alison Biggs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3078 **Comment Id:** 357887 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs, especially urban dogs, need these areas for exercise and recreation. These areas are vital to dogs that tend to live in small areas with small or worse, no yards. Pet owners who do not have yards, which is commonplace in cities like San Francisco, rely on these areas to exercise their pets. Without them, we have a serious quality of life issue for the humans and dogs in this equation.

Organization:

Commenter: Monica H **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3078 **Comment Id:** 357888 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To ban these off-leash areas may cause would-be pet owners to feel that they have no place to take their pets for exercise and recreation, and thus make it harder to be a pet owner. Not to extrapolate too much, but our pet adoption rates are so poor as it is.

Organization:

Commenter: Monica H **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3097 **Comment Id:** 357897 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs become less aggressive when they are off leash since they do not feel restricted or constrained
Organization:
Commenter: Gary W Rowbury **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3113 **Comment Id:** 357918 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My husband volunteers at the Humane Society and his concern if these restrictions go into place, is that fewer dogs will be adopted and more dogs will be euthanized.
Organization:
Commenter: Jean Lurssen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3136 **Comment Id:** 357923 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: PLEASE don't limit dog off leash places (even more than how terrible it is now) for dogsand seriously spend a little more time to accommodate the MANY tax payers that hope for more places to let their dogs loose for better mental and physical health!
Organization:
Commenter: niloofar ehsani **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3222 **Comment Id:** 357993 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Running, walking, and hiking together in the open air with our dogs boosts the body, the heart and the soul of us both - keeping both dog and human healthy. It is so very important for us, and even more important for our animals! Enclosed urban dog parks and leash-only areas are simply no replacement for open beaches and parklands where owner and pet can run freely.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3231 **Comment Id:** 358001 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not ban off-leash dog walking. My dog loves running around and playing fetch. She is very well trained and very loving towards other people and dogs. She loves children and even insists that small toddlers throw the ball for her. My dog would not be happy if she had to be on-leash at parks and crissy field.
Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3232 **Comment Id:** 358002 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm someone who walks twice daily with my designated service dog in the Rancho Corral de Tierra (Montara) section of GGNRA. When he is exercised, he is calm and can be in therapy mode/perform his service duties. But if he were forced to stay on leash, there is no way he'd get the exercise he needs - - and would therefore not be calm enough to perform the services he is trained for. I moved to Montara 12 years ago for the specific purpose of being able to exercise my therapy dog off leash within walking distance from my house.
Organization:
Commenter: chelsea hardaway **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3238 **Comment Id:** 358011 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Xavier Brouard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3243 **Comment Id:** 358016 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Conflicts with dogs and people are the result of too many restrictions. Dogs need space to run around, and so do dog owners. If you prevent that, dogs and people get angry and frustrated, like I am right now.
Organization:
Commenter: RC Charles **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3268 **Comment Id:** 358036 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dogs depend on free space to run free and get his energy out.
Organization:
Commenter: Jan Val **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3289 **Comment Id:** 358046 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not limit off leash running for dogs. My dog is a greyhound and NEEDS to be able to run freely for his health and well-being. His life will be greatly negatively

impacted by such restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3292 **Comment Id:** 358049 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It's so important that dogs are allowed off leash, for their mental and physical health. Dog owners in SF are well aware of the responsibilities for socializing their animals
Organization:
Commenter: carmen casado **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3293 **Comment Id:** 358051 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, keeping a dog on leash often times does not provide the dog with enough exercise (speaking from experience), they are usually kept in the house during the day are waiting to be allowed out to explore.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3354 **Comment Id:** 358222 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I cannot imagine not being able to enjoy these areas with my dogs. I walk, bike, rollerblade in these areas with my dogs as well as have them swim in the bay. Being able to do this with them has added so much to my life and theirs.
Organization:
Commenter: Marnie Wright **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3376 **Comment Id:** 358276 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed alternative. These areas have forever been a place where dogs can roam free. I know my dog is happiest when she can run freely through the sand and water at the beach. The new proposal is way too restrictive, and will prevent my dog and me from enjoying the daily walks that I have come to love and cherish.
Organization:
Commenter: Taylor D Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3379 **Comment Id:** 358294 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I can't imagine not being to take him to Fort Funston and watch him play in the

waves while we enjoy the beautiful sunset. Seeing how happy he is, and indeed all the dogs and dog people at Fort Funston, gives me joy and a clear perspective. Walking Dexter on a leash would be a completely different experience. He and I would be miserable. We couldn't play, I couldn't stop to admire the scenery. We'd both get a lot less exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Isabelle N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3383 **Comment Id:** 358295 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am 13 years old and I strongly oppose alternative F because I have a dog, and if you prohibit dogs on most trails then there is no way he can get exercise and have fun. I don't think it is fair to ban a whole species from certain areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Jackson N Fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3385 **Comment Id:** 358300 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: i think dogs should be more free and not stay on leashes when they go out to the park. they should be able to run and get some exercise and do what they want. if dogs stay on leashes, they wont be able to get exercise and wont enjoy going to the park anymore. their owners wouldn't enjoy playing with their dog at the park because they have to stay on their leashes.

Organization:

Commenter: norton c **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3536 **Comment Id:** 359162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a dog owner, but I do not feel that either I or my dog will suffer if off-leash dog areas are restricted. People who own dogs in an urban area should accept that most of the time, their dogs should be leashed.

Organization:

Commenter: Jenifer Steele **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3625 **Comment Id:** 359264 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are already too few areas within the GGNRA in which dogs can be walked off leash. Off leash walking is necessary to the health of the dogs and their human companions who live in the Bay Area. If off leash walking within the GGNRA is further restricted as proposed, it is less likely that dogs will be able to run free. As a result, they may become anxious, stressed and agressive while on leash. This is not good for the human community.

Organization:
Commenter: Eleanor M Roman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3640 **Comment Id:** 359265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a professional dog trainer in San Francisco, I am keenly aware of the behavioral effects on dogs who aren't getting enough off-leash exercise. The preferred alternative will result in significant behavioral impacts on countless dogs in San Francisco who will be confined to dog parks, many of which are already over crowded. This means the preferred alternative will result in SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS to SF Bay Area parks, increased noise and congestion, and dramatic negative impacts on the quality of life of dogs, their human guardians, as well as humans who don't own dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Manolius **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4011 **Comment Id:** 359664 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. Without such designated areas, many dogs are going to be foreclosed from exercise, resulting in stressed and unhealthy dogs, unhappy owners, and overcrowded animal shelters. As a long-time volunteer at the SF/SPCA, I know how painful it is for people to be forced to surrender their pets due to their circumstances. I am very concerned about the impact that this plan will have on animal abandonment, which the SF/SPCA is working so hard to end.
Organization:
Commenter: Robyn A Leonard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3805 **Comment Id:** 359881 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: She plays there with the other dogs, runs along the beach, and splashes in the ocean. It's crucial for her to get this exercise and to socialize with other dogs. Not having this outlet truly scares me, because too much pent up energy never makes for a safe situation.
Organization:
Commenter: Leah D Wanta **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3839 **Comment Id:** 359960 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: No way could I run fast enough or long enough to give them what they need to stay fit and healthy. Not to mention how well they are socialized from having this opportunity.
Organization: Mountain House Feral Cat Rescue
Commenter: Roxanne Spence **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3839 **Comment Id:** 359961 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: They are far better behaved than most dogs we pass on our daily morning trail walks where every dog is confined to a leash, leaving them feel powerless and often anxious and defensive. Freedom is essential for a dogs health and social skills.

Organization: Mountain House Feral Cat Rescue

Commenter: Roxanne Spence **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3853 **Comment Id:** 359983 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I can not imagine why you are questioning having off leash areas for the welfare of the dogs. Most dog owners appreciate and respect the off leash areas. Please don't rescind them

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea Arrick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3856 **Comment Id:** 359986 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need mental and physical exercise. Going at their own pace, sniffing, is what the dogs do on a hike. I have seen very few fights and so many happy dogs. It is a quality of life issue for our dogs. Why should dogs have to suffer? They are animals who also deserve a place within GGNRA to just be dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane Zabielskis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3861 **Comment Id:** 359990 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Leash walks are not enough to allow dogs to run the way they've been bred to. And those of us who cannot run alongside our dogs should not be prevented from getting them appropriate exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia E Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3936 **Comment Id:** 360083 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep off-leash dog parks in San Francisco and the surrounding Bay Area. We are responsible dog owners who always have our dog under voice command and are attentive to her when she is off-leash. Without off-leash areas, our dog would not get the kind of exercise she needs to be healthy and happy.

Organization:

Commenter: Amy DiBenedetto **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3937 **Comment Id:** 360085 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dogs depend on me for their wellbeing and I depend on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for off-leash dog recreation, without which, I would not adequately exercise my dogs or myself.
Organization:
Commenter: Randall E Fitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3942 **Comment Id:** 360108 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: we should be encouraging pet ownership which promotes urban resident psychoological and physical health. In particular, dogs are required to take their owners on frequent walks. Please do it also for the health of the dogs which cannot get the exercise they need at the end of a tether.
Organization:
Commenter: Timothy A Covington **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3953 **Comment Id:** 360130 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne Z **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3954 **Comment Id:** 360150 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I regularly take Hammie to Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field, where she enjoys romping off leash with other dogs. By getting her exercise in these off-leash environments, Hammie is a management and safe pet in more urban environments.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3958 **Comment Id:** 360187 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: 50% o SF households have a dog and restricting us to such a small area will not allow me to exercise and play with my dog for his health, and mine, in a way that is enjoyable

for us

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Tausend **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3985 **Comment Id:** 360347 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It will be a shame and very frustrating for San Francisco dog owners if off leash was taken away. We realize there are always the exception to the rule, and non-San Franciscan's who being dogs into the city, but 99% o the dog owners I know are extremely respectful of the parks and beaches. We pick up after our dogs, obey the rules and really just want a place for our dogs to exercise and run to burn energy that is needed to make a dog happy and healthy.

Organization:

Commenter: Elena T Longinetti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4003 **Comment Id:** 360436 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep off-leash possibilities at Muir Beach! There is no way I can get my hound enough exercise if I have to keep him on a leash. When he runs freely, as he can at Muir Beach, he runs so fast and long, I could never keep up! It is essential for his health and well-being (not to mention mine ;-)

Organization:

Commenter: Anita R Ostrom **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4509 **Comment Id:** 360453 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: we need the places we have now to spend time that creates healthy dogs, by keeping them exercised and happy. I need to swim my Lab for his hip dysplasia and arthritis and I have no options but the ocean. It's for his health.

Organization:

Commenter: Austen Eddy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4520 **Comment Id:** 360470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And when they hit the beach - it is amazing how they run around and chase each other and meet other dogs. They could not do this safely anywhere else. And it is a joy that should be preserved to all who have access to this.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Marshall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4535 **Comment Id:** 360490 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not change the amount of open and off leash space. It would decrease or almost eliminate something that enriches my life and my dogs' lives so much. We utilize these open spaces for socialization and exercise every week.
Organization:
Commenter: Jessica M Stanton **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4555 **Comment Id:** 360604 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4557 **Comment Id:** 360607 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would like to voice my opposition to your dog management plan. I live in Sonoma and I am handicapped. My well behaved labrador retriever and I regularly drive down to Crissy Field because he loves that beach. It is the only place where I can park myself in my wheel chair and throw the ball for my dog so he gets some exercise and I can sit back and watch him play with the other dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Nicholas Choulos **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4564 **Comment Id:** 360634 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Allowing our dogs to run and socialize with other dogs makes them happier and safer for the community as a whole.
Organization:
Commenter: Joe Vohs **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4569 **Comment Id:** 360647 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have lived with wonderful rescued German Shepherds for much of that time; they have been socialized and active dogs who loved meeting other dogs and running and playing off-leash. Doing so kept them, and me, healthy and happy.
Organization:

Commenter: Susan Eason **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4572 **Comment Id:** 360660 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In order to get the proper exercise that some dogs need, they need to be off leash. To run and play with other dogs, to run and fetch a ball, to swimming are just some activities that can NOT be done on a leash with the owner at the other end of this leash.
Organization:
Commenter: nicole skerry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4604 **Comment Id:** 361129 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: San Francisco is a haven for otherwise unwanted dogs who would be euthanized. Many of these are working dog breeds that need significant amounts of activity to be physically and emotionally healthy. These dogs are also of above average intelligence and are easily trained to obey voice commands and hand signals. Off leash exercise for these dogs is essential to their well being.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathy N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4619 **Comment Id:** 361139 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is outrageous that this project would take away the some of the extremely limited areas dog owners have to allow their dogs to go off leash. A dog that is regularly allowed to run off leash is a better behaved animal as any dog owner can attest. Please reconsider this plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie Balog **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4635 **Comment Id:** 361152 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is so important for the mental health of both dogs and their companions. To take away this opportunity for people and their companions will have detrimental health effects that are bad for both the dogs and their humans. I often suggest that women get dogs to walk with for their health for safety and companionship to get them outside and moving.
Organization:
Commenter: Penelope J Fetsch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4641 **Comment Id:** 361160 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need places to run and play to be healthy and well adjusted.
Organization:
Commenter: Wendy Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4644 **Comment Id:** 361165 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: John Delaplane **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4654 **Comment Id:** 361187 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am 10 years old and I love taking my dog to the beach, watching her run up hills. It makes her so happy to be able to run free without a leash. She is so so so happy when we go for hikes. I don't want to take away from that because of some silly rule
Organization:
Commenter: Caitlin Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4092 **Comment Id:** 361273 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs are not meant to be stuck in an apartment all day, but the active lifestyle of these residents plus these off leash areas where dogs and owners are able to play fetch and run freely make that all possible. Additionally, these off leash areas allow dogs to run through all their excess energy making them content to sit at home for hours at a time. Without these off leash areas dogs will have excessive energy stuck in an apartment and will probably bark and tear the house apart. These changes will have major impacts that we may not even be able to foresee. Ones that I can think of include dogs stuck in apartments barking all day causing neighbors to get frustrated and potentially cause major arguments and less enjoyable living conditions. Dogs that are not able to get all their energy out and play in a productive manner can become aggressive and we may see more aggressive dogs on leash due to these restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Ferragano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4674 **Comment Id:** 361311 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is simply the case that all mammals need exercise - if we were to restrict adults to remain at their desks all day, or prevent children from playing, we would very quickly see negative effects. It is the same with dogs - we need to have these areas in which they can

exercise, for their health and for their mental well being. To deny them of this is little more that than to deliberately increase suffering of a group (dogs) that want little more than to be able to play.

Organization:

Commenter: Kevin Rochowski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4689 **Comment Id:** 361336 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to strongly opposed the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I am a dog owner in San Francisco and the GGNRA parks have been fundamental to me being able to raise a happy healthy pet. There's nothing that brings me as much joy as seeing my dog get excited as he smells Chrissy Field's beach air.

Organization:

Commenter: Siobhan Quinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4709 **Comment Id:** 361366 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog would be devestated if he could play with his friends freely at one of his favorite parks

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah E Amaya **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4715 **Comment Id:** 361377 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The shear joy my dog expresses while running off leash at his favorite park, Fort Funston, is unparalleled and certainly a difficult experience to recreate anywhere else, especially given the staggering lack of available ROLAs in the Bay Area. After waiting patiently all day for me to return from work, it is the only opportunity for him to socialize, get exercise and simply be a dog. It is also a great opportunity for me to enjoy the beautiful landscapes and soundscapes the GGNRA has to offer. The loss of this daily enrichment would be devastating and have a severe impact on quality of life not only for myself and my dog, but certainly for the hundreds of visitors who flock to the parks each day.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4731 **Comment Id:** 361405 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What I do know if that if this plan goes through and dogs do not get exercise and then flood the small parks we can expect the following; more bites and injuries for dogs and humans, increased euthanasia, more dogs begin abandoned at the shelter, decreased health benefits for people that cannot safely walk their dogs.

Organization:
Commenter: caroline beeler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4740 **Comment Id:** 361418 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I find it extraordinary that a new proposal further limiting dog access needs to be considered at all. Dogs need fresh air and freedom to run just like humans. The existing restrictions are already excessive and further restricting dog freedom in the parks would be deeply saddening.
Organization:
Commenter: ELIOTT SCOTT **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4756 **Comment Id:** 361424 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off-leash areas are particularly precious because dogs need to socialize with one another off-leash; socializing is a core behavior and it's cruel to deprive dogs of it. Dogs that get adequate exercise and socialization are healthier, safer dogs. Dogs that are cooped up become a threat to city dwellers. Any animal deprived of its basic needs becomes a problem, as the NPS must surely know.
Organization:
Commenter: Cameron Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4757 **Comment Id:** 361428 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We find that off-leash walking is much more effective in terms of exercise, and dogs in general, not just our dogs, are much better behaved when off-leash. When our dogs are walked on-leash, especially our Australian Cattle Dog, they are more territorial and protective. When our dogs are off-leash they have a chance to authentically interact with each other and figure out how to behave.
Organization:
Commenter: Vivian M Walz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4781 **Comment Id:** 361518 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: With off-leash play and walking, we aren't limiting the amount our dog wants to run and get exercise. If we lost the privilege to walk our dog off-leash on Crissy Field, we feel that it would hurt the health of our dog. We do not feel that walking our dog in a city dog park filled with other dogs is adequate. He needs continuous aerobic exercise daily to ensure that his weight stays down (which in turn helps ensure he has healthy joints). Off-leash play in open spaces is also important for him to remain comfortable and social around all different types of dogs. The existing dog parks are already too crowded, and too overwhelming for dogs and

owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Katherine Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4785 **Comment Id:** 361524 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It will prevent me and the thousands of other responsible people who enjoy recreating with their dogs in the GGNRA from doing so, thus negatively impacting our own mental and physical health and the health of our dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Laurie Berk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4787 **Comment Id:** 361527 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who recreates on a regular basis with my dogs in the GGNRA, I am strongly opposed to the preferred alternative outlined in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The overly restrictive nature of the proposed restrictions will prevent large number of law-abiding dog owners from recreating in the area and offering dogs a natural and healthy outdoor experience.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4791 **Comment Id:** 361542 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA's mission is to provide access to nature for residents of an urban area. It's an essential mission - having open places that urban residents and visitors can enjoy and to foster taking care of our natural environment. AND, it's a fact that urban dwellers have pets who bring joy and companionship into their lives. These pets deserve space to enjoy fresh air and exercise. These elements are important components to good health and disposition.

Organization: retired

Commenter: Ann Sasaki **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4794 **Comment Id:** 361547 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to urge you to keep the off leash areas as they are. My dog is a runner and needs more exercise than I am able to provide. My physical limitations may hinder me from walking fast, but when we do reach the off lease sites, my dog has the ability to run free! This means he gets his exercise and great socialization.

Organization:

Commenter: Rebecca Edens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4797 **Comment Id:** 361555 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am writing in opposition to the Preferred Alternative. This plan is too restrictive. The GGNRA should be an area for all to enjoy equally. Taking away off leash areas and creating this limited access is unfair. I walk my dog off leash at Fort Funston and it is good for my health as well as my dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Phillip R Benedetti **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4799 **Comment Id:** 361557 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: A large population of cooped up dogs is good for no one. Unable to socialize and exercise, bad things are more likely to happen than good. Once that happens, I worry the dog owners will also be blamed.
Organization:
Commenter: Ben Dutro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4818 **Comment Id:** 361597 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash in San Francisco has built a great dog community. It is social and more healthy for dogs to be able to roam freely in parks. I strongly appose this move toward banning off-leash and fetch. As long as people pick up after their dog and socialise their dog so the dog is safe and able to be among other dogs, there is ABSOLUTELY no reason for this change.
Organization:
Commenter: Emily B Taggart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4840 **Comment Id:** 361618 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a resident of San Francisco's Lower Pacific Heights for the past 14 years, and a dog-owner for the past 9, I am writing to strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4854 **Comment Id:** 361638 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: That means access to off leash areas so they may be physically and mentally healthy. You can't ignore the fact that we live with dogs-this plan would be cruel and inhumane.
Organization:
Commenter: carrie sullivan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4867 **Comment Id:** 361647 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please let dogs play off-leash. I don't own a dog, I care about the environment, and I think dogs should be able to play freely. They need it to be healthy and happy.
Organization:
Commenter: Grant Patterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4873 **Comment Id:** 361673 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are already so many people needing a place to hang out with their doggy besties, where on good days it is already almost near impossible to find parking and access, limiting the amount of area we have by a staggering 75% rally is cruelty and neglect for these animals, as well as their owners. I honestly believe that having these quality off leash areas promote healthy ownership of animals.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4874 **Comment Id:** 361675 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are family and they need to exercise and socialize in open, safe and large areas. Restricting exercise and socialization to limited contained spaces will increase the risk of dog fights and make those areas unfit for good use due to the shear volume of dogs in one area.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4882 **Comment Id:** 361686 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a San Francisco resident, I object to any plan that prohibits or greatly reduces off-leash areas in the City. Dogs are family members and they need off-leash exercise just as children do.
Organization:
Commenter: Kurt N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4887 **Comment Id:** 361705 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My wife and I bring our dog to Crissy Field and Fort Mason regularly, and it is one of the few opportunities our dog has to really run and get the exercise he needs. This is a meaningful and valuable part of our lives in this city, and it is essential in keeping our dog happy and healthy. There is *no way* that we could get him the kind of exercise he needs on leash, and the dog parks, which are fine for daily use, are not a substitute for the kind of safe and vigorous exercise our dog Kid can get in more open spaces.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A T N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4890 **Comment Id:** 361707 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need a safe and fun place to get exercise and run and play with their owners. Keeping GGNRA open for this use is important to the health and well being of dogs and the people who love them. Please keep these areas open for off leash play.

Organization:

Commenter: Mark D Ewalt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4900 **Comment Id:** 361744 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: While your interests are valid, restricting off-leash areas is not the answer. These regulations could be drastic for the health and well-being of dogs all over the Bay Area. Shelters are already overrun; please do not enact regulations that will contribute to the death of animals.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Scangos **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4900 **Comment Id:** 361745 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need exercise, and while it is a form of recreation, it also serves important purposes, with life-and-death consequences. Dogs need exercise to behave appropriately. Not properly exercised dogs often develop behavior problems out of boredom, and too often then end up at shelters because they are deemed unmanageable. A simple walk on a leash will not suffice to keep these behavior problems at bay.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Scangos **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4906 **Comment Id:** 361759 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If I don't have a safe, large off-leash area for my dog to run she's going to get irritable and bored.

Organization:

Commenter: Susy Siddens **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4907 **Comment Id:** 361761 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I use the GGNRA parkland at both Crissy Field and Fort Funston with my dog regularly, and I am extremely upset by and strongly opposed to the preferred alternative described in the new draft dog management plan. It's way too restrictive, and will inhibit my ability to use this land to support mine and my dog's health and well-being as I have for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Barry R Perlman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4927 **Comment Id:** 361785 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This kind of drastic limiting measure will not just impact the quality of life of our dogs but also our families who enjoy the companionship and small amount of freedom allowed in these parks.I often meet people who don't own pets but come out to watch the dogs swim and run around as well as tourists who enjoy taking photos of my dog's "swim team".
Organization:
Commenter: YVONNE MELLING **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4957 **Comment Id:** 361836 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: A large portion of people and their dogs in the area use these parks to exercise their dogs, which in turns helps reduce destructive and aggressive tendencies in some dogs when properly exercised. I have never felt threatened or in danger at the dog park from a dog owner or their dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathleen K **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4963 **Comment Id:** 361856 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Not only do my dogs need to run, I need to walk, being ridden with rheumatoid arthritis. Moving, walking allows me to be functional, working and out of pain. I remain in San Francisco because of all the gorgeous areas in which I am able to walk and my dogs run. PLEASE do not take away this from me and all the MANY dog owners and dogs (still more dogs per capita than anywhere else in the nation, I believe!).
Organization:
Commenter: Laura J Small **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4972 **Comment Id:** 361873 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Teddy has become a relaxed and social dog, good with all kinds of adults and children, and all kinds of dogs. I attribute this to our many wonderful hours of playing off-leach with the mix of people and dogs at Chrissy Field beach as well as the many other beaches of the Presidio.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5000 **Comment Id:** 361905 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Where are the dogs to get their exercise if they cannot run in the parks and beaches. Looking around Fort Funston this morning, everyone there had a dog. How many people would be walking and getting their exercise without a dog?

Organization:

Commenter: Louise Todd **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5019 **Comment Id:** 362014 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog and family in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. This plan is very restrictive and will prevent me and my family from using the RECREATIONAL spaces with our dog in a way that supports our health and the health of our dog.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4119 **Comment Id:** 362045 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The saying goes, "a tired dog is a happy dog", but how can that happen if the parks, beach or other areas make regulations or policies that prevent our dogs or other pets from getting the exercise they need? Not everyone is physically capable of running their dogs to the extent they need, which is why these parks, beaches and areas are important in a city such as San Francisco or in the surrounding suburbs. The most popular game of "fetch", which is done by all breeds of dog, not just our beloved retrievers, is absolutely impossible if your dog has to be on leash everywhere you go. The amount of exercise certain breeds need is too much for a person to "walk" it. Also we, and I am sure many others cannot afford to have their dog walked a couple times a day, everyday to meet the needs of the dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian Muirhead **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4139 **Comment Id:** 362070 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Keep the off-leash/under voice control areas as they are today (February 15, 2014), free and open for dogs' exercise off-leash. Dogs are scentient beings and need freedom to be dogs. Lack of proper off-leash/voice control exercise for pets leads to their frustration and possibly aggression which these further restrictions would bring to fruition through cause and effect.

Organization:

Commenter: William J Harter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5041 **Comment Id:** 362102 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I beg you with all the dog love in the world to keep bay area hiking trails off leash. A happy dog is an active dog. And sad dog is a sad owner.

Organization:

Commenter: Alexandra Rosalsky **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5044 **Comment Id:** 362108 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am for off leash areas for dogs because it gives my dog appropriate space and atmosphere to socialize. When on leash my dog is more defensive and less susceptibility to have 100% psitive interactions. He has NEVER had a negative experience with another dog off leash at fort funston. Without these areas I believe that there will be higher aggression rates

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5049 **Comment Id:** 362115 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Banning off leash areas and further restricting where dogs are allowed will do nothing to prevent damage to nature or the environment. The only thing it will create are unhappy unbalanced dog, who are never permitted to run, and unhappy dog owners. I urge those reading this to maintain the 1979 pet policy as it allows an outlet for healthy animals and healthy owners. It promotes physical exercise for both and allows the dogs to learn to socialize with each other. By isolating dogs in their houses you are doing no one good and everyone harm.

Organization:

Commenter: Ben Hobson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5056 **Comment Id:** 362126 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What is it hurting to allow animals to enjoy the parks as people do. For the most part, I've seen responsible dog owners who clean up after their animal and it's necessary for these animals to have the ability to run for exercise and mental fitness.

Organization:

Commenter: Jen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5060 **Comment Id:** 362140 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Responsible and humane stewardship of caring for a dog includes a healthy amount of off-leash exercise and play. San Francisco has a large population of pet dogs, and these dogs and their families deserve the right to use the GGNRA lands for recreation just as do other citizens
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Berlin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5075 **Comment Id:** 362156 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If dogs are restricted from running and socializing and getting their energy out, they can go stir crazy and their frustration can make everyone around them sad and frustrated too. I think that the risk is great that the issues some people have with dogs will get worse if they are unable to get the proper exercise they need.
Organization:
Commenter: Z Meherali **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5081 **Comment Id:** 362162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The bay area is a dog friendly place to live and many dogs need to run around off leash to truly have a high quality of life (not to mention helping their people have a higher quality of life).
Organization:
Commenter: Athena M Barouxis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5092 **Comment Id:** 362169 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not eliminate the off leash dog parks that currently exist. Having a place to play off leash is very important to help dogs socialize. If you take away these areas, dogs in California will become leash aggressive and unfriendly as is fairly common in Washington, DC where we have lived.
Organization:
Commenter: Cynthia N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5094 **Comment Id:** 362171 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I visit Fort Funston on a weekly basis with my dog Kato and I see how happy

he is while playing there. Not only does he thrive while visiting the off leash areas, I benefit from it too.

Organization:

Commenter: David Yip **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5103 **Comment Id:** 362182 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I walk my dog regularly off leash via voice command in the GGNRA and I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft Dog Management Plan. For me, this plan is too restrictive and will prevent me from exercising with my dog, impacting not only my health, but the health of my dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Amy Puffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5106 **Comment Id:** 362189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Tara A Medve **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5115 **Comment Id:** 362253 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need a place to recreate and exercise! Don't take away the already limited space dog owners have to bring their beloved pets. It is cruel to limit space for dogs to run and play. This space is needed.

Organization:

Commenter: Brigette A Guldbech **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5145 **Comment Id:** 362276 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: She is under voice control and requires time off-leash to obtain the exercise she needs to support her physical and mental health. A dog park or fenced in area does not work. Our dog does not get the exercise she needs in a fenced in area or pen. Being so friendly, she says hello to all the dogs and people at the park, and unless the "right" dog is there, she will stand around and not get any exercise. Also a dog park does not give us, my family, the opportunity to experience and exercise in a beautiful environment, one of the pertinent reasons we chose to live and work in Marin and the San Francisco Bay Area, together.

Organization:

Commenter: Jill Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5152 **Comment Id:** 362285 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Having direct access to the beach and the permitted trails increases my quality of life because I get to exercise myself and my dogs in this beautiful environment. In addition, my dogs go to Fort Funston almost every weekday with their dogwalker while I am at work, which gives me peace of mind because their need for physical activity is fulfilled.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5155 **Comment Id:** 362292 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: They run and have fun, go home and crash. It gets and keeps them healthy, and decreases aggression in the dogs and their people. Doing this gets and keeps us healthy.
Organization:
Commenter: Jewel L Rose **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5183 **Comment Id:** 362512 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is important to have a safe (away from traffic) and spacious area for dogs to run, interact, socialize and enjoy.
Organization:
Commenter: Julia N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5185 **Comment Id:** 362523 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I make extensive use of GGNRA lands, especially in Marin County. Walking is an essential part of both my dog's health and my own. Off-leash exercise is critical to my dog's health and happiness.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen Gimber **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5192 **Comment Id:** 362556 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please save off leash locales. All dogs deserve to the get exercise they need. Ours for one is best served & cared for when she gets the physical exercise she needs. (running off leash!)This contribute-s to her being more relaxed, balanced & feeling safe.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5202 **Comment Id:** 362594 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is hard for big dogs in particular when they do not have places to get exercise, and the more difficult it is for people to find opportunities to let them run, the more strain it is on these animals.
Organization:
Commenter: Johannes Rothlind **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5209 **Comment Id:** 362607 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a dog owner, I believe that removing access to dog-friendly beaches and trails as part of this plan will have a decidedly negative impact on the well-being of pets and their owners in our community. We believe that there is already a dearth of open spaces where dogs can have healthy, stimulating exercise. We would like to continue to have access to these great areas for years to come.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Son **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5211 **Comment Id:** 362615 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: One of our favorite family pastimes is walking down to Ocean Beach and running our dog. He gets to run full speed through the surf, fetch the ball and play with his friends. How sad we would all be to have this taken away! Please reconsider your ban
Organization:
Commenter: Ymke Dioquino **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5212 **Comment Id:** 362619 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition to the exercise (without joint load) the swimming provides, the saltwater eventually evaporating in their fur facilitates a healthy (flea free) dog. I've never seen the dogs deficate in the water, although I've had to clean-up after them on the beach. None of the parasites that are common in dogs present a hazard to life in the ocean or beach flora & fauna. Please continue to allow responsible dog owners to continue their use in restricted beach areas as you have been.
Organization:
Commenter: Janis M Cary **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5246 **Comment Id:** 362778 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Marin county residents are doing an outstanding and much needed job in adopting unwanted dogs that the government shelters are currently killing, up to 6 million a year, which of course costs a bundle of cash, not to mention this and the toll on our sense of good. They need the beaches and trails to exercise their dogs, they are being environmentally considerate by adopting these dogs in the first place. This will take away the tools they need to care for the animals that our society has thrown away like trash.

Organization:

Commenter: deborah f birmingham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5251 **Comment Id:** 362810 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: These regular excursions provide my dogs much needed exercise and myself some much appreciated time in nature with my dogs, who I love dearly.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Nightingale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5273 **Comment Id:** 362851 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: By significantly reducing the off-leash dog areas, we will undoubtedly over time see an increase in aggressive dog behavior. Dogs need to be exercised, and more importantly, well socialized. The off leash dog parks allow for this to occur.

Organization:

Commenter: Lori Pryt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5280 **Comment Id:** 362869 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need off leash time to get adequate exercise. People and dogs have been enjoying the GGNRA for this purpose for decades, and off leash areas should be protected in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane I Gaito **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5286 **Comment Id:** 362875 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are so few places left in Marin and SF where we can take our dog off leash and get proper exercise. We live in a very densely populated area, and part of the trade off are the magnificent lands of GGNRA. We depend on the limited space we do access with our dog to get her exercise and play.

Organization:

Commenter: Brad Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362894 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: They would run the beach, chase each other and play with their toys. These were some of the days we enjoyed most as a family and the dogs always came home tired and satisfied. If they had been forced to remain on a leash, or even not allowed on more than half of our wonderful Baker Beach, it would have been an exercise of frustration, similar to taking a kid to a candy store and not allowing them any candy.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5291 **Comment Id:** 362895 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 30 years.
Organization:
Commenter: Natala Menezes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5293 **Comment Id:** 362898 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please continue allowing Oak Wood trail to remain off leash. It is a cherished part of my life in Mill Valley. My dog and I walk there multiple times a week. Appropriate off-leash trails are crucial to the health and well being of our dogs,
Organization:
Commenter: Hilary O'Brien **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5294 **Comment Id:** 362907 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason and Fort Funston for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Anna Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5307 **Comment Id:** 362939 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Once there, Yoki gets to run freely under my voice control with her dog friends. It is so good for her health and for mine. She is a happy dog because she is able to run and play, then come back to me. And I am her happy human companion being witness to her pure joy. This off-leash freedom is something I can give her when she gives me so much every day. Without a large off-leash open area like Fort Funston I would not be able to allow my dog this kind of play time pleasure. Due to my illness I am not able to run with her to keep her exercised. So the off-leash freedom to run at Fort Funston in a safe area with other dogs is a godsend to my current life situation.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan L Damron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5309 **Comment Id:** 362947 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We need to preserve off leash recreation for the health and well being of our pets. This in turn will promote the health and well being of our citizenry as we can exercise ourselves as well as our pets. Restricting off leash areas is dangerous for all pf us as we all become less able to properly exercise our bodies along with our canine companions.

Organization:

Commenter: Marilyn Harrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5314 **Comment Id:** 362953 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash versus on leash makes a world of difference in terms of his happiness and and overall health.. He has very strong name recall and has been trained to stick by my side ever since he was a puppy. Training him properly allowed us both to have the quality of life that is far better than making a dog stay on leash or fenced in.

Organization:

Commenter: Tracey Gold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5321 **Comment Id:** 362968 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am certain that these free runs on the beach where she gets to play with many other dogs and people in a low stress environment, are a huge part of her excellent socialization that makes her a kind, obedient, and happy dog. It certainly goes a Kong way to keeping us both healthy. The bay area very much needs,our off leash spaces. There are so many dogs, and so many responsible pet owners counting on you to save our off leash areas. Please don't let us down. Please vote to keep them for all of us.

Organization:

Commenter: Traci Burleigh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA161238

Correspondence Id: 5335 **Comment Id:** 362974 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Being able to take my dog to an area that allows them to run free and play with other dogs is not only fun for the dog, but fun for the owners. In my experience most dog owners are responsible and take pride in the environment. For those that aren't, education is key.

Organization:

Commenter: debi N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5356 **Comment Id:** 362998 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It's great for people and dogs alike to be able to get out and enjoy the beautiful California coast and weather, and for the dogs to frolic and socialize and run out their energy. Dog owners already have so few places they can take their dogs, and I sincerely hope the NPS deeply considers all of this when they make their final decision about what to do with Fort Funston and Crissy Field, but removing these as options for dog owners in they bay would be a huge loss for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5381 **Comment Id:** 363030 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If we want to have "balanced dogs" we need to meet their needs. The end of a 6 foot leash is not enough to create a balanced life. I have seen incredibly stable and balanced dogs in the off-leash areas where I walk my dog. I have great concern for what behavior we will create with our canine companions when we limit their balanced life.

Organization: vizslawalk

Commenter: Lynne L Davie **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5393 **Comment Id:** 363045 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog needs exercise to maintain a healthy weight and Fort Funston in particular is extremely important to that. The off leash areas on the beach are one of the few areas where he can run freely over long, flat distances. And the sand is good for his legs, particularly if he develops arthritis as he gets older. Please keep the off leash areas as-is.

Organization:

Commenter: David Berger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5426 **Comment Id:** 363211 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash dog space makes this city unique. It provides adventure and exercise for our dogs. It is vital for their health and the health of our city. Please reconsider taking away

our off-leash dog parks!!
Organization: Modern Hound
Commenter: Shoshaunna Parks **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5427 **Comment Id:** 363213 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I exercise my dog on Crissy Field/Fort Mason and Ocean Beach daily and our walker takes her to Baker Beach and Fort Funston. There would be very few places in the city where she (and I) would get sufficient exercise if this plan were implemented, and roaming the beaches and parks is one of the reasons I love living in San Francisco.
Organization:
Commenter: Anna Fabiano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5435 **Comment Id:** 363241 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Think about your options. Please don't go through with this. Lilly and I would greatly appreciate it! She loves to run and this would be heart breaking to me and her. Her mood will change and just like humans she will be depressed due to her lack of exercise. Please, please don't go through with this!
Organization:
Commenter: Ashley M Hiben **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5440 **Comment Id:** 363261 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is one of the greatest places and areas for me to exercise and my dog to do the same. its not only our 4 legged friends that get a good work out ever time we visit, Funston and Chrisy. We all benefit from these walks, we need these areas (and more of them) with easy access for all.
Organization: TBD
Commenter: Ursula McCurry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5442 **Comment Id:** 363263 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please don't close the areas out dogs are allowed in and off leash. My family has two dogs that are active and needs areas like GGNRA to run around and release some of their energy!!
Organization:
Commenter: Eliza Stuber **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5443 **Comment Id:** 363268 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly oppose the preferred alternative in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I regularly take my dog to Crissy Field and other GGNRA areas. My dog Olive loves to run and play fetch off leash. She is very well behaved and responsive to verbal commands, so is never in danger of harming off-trail wildlife. Depriving her of and I of this activity is a major blow to each of us and our respective physical and mental health.

Organization:

Commenter: Lauren T Gehman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5473 **Comment Id:** 363336 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not make us regret rescuing Foxy!! The proposed changes will make it very challenging for us to get her the exercise and attention she needs.

Organization:

Commenter: Scott B Willoughby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5474 **Comment Id:** 363337 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our dogs need "off leash" exercise for everyone's sanity and safety. If they don't get it you will probably see a rise in biting incidents. Because dogs, like humans, get a little loopy without running. Please do not lessen our ability to exercise our dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Ficarro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5482 **Comment Id:** 363345 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep dog friendly- off leash beaches and parks available in the Bay Area. We travel down to SF frequently and these areas help to keep my dog healthy and happy. In a high populated space like the bay is, these spots are essential to overall well being. As a NYS licensed Veterinary Technician, I can not stress this enough. Dogs need a safe place to run and exercise. Socialization happens at the places which helps dogs to interact appropriately with other dogs from an early age.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5488 **Comment Id:** 363352 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our dog is an integral part of our lives and we do our duty to keep her as healthy and happy as any possible - similar to any parent. Taking our dog to local recreation areas to run is the primary source for her health and happiness - as well as one of ours.

Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Palmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5511 **Comment Id:** 363889 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Not to mention that dog outnumber children in San Francisco, the GGNRA is proposing that the other 90% o people essentially "stack" their dogs on top of one another at the specific parks that sanction. This will create FAR MORE PROBLEMS in the community. As a professional dog walker and business owner since 2005, the negative ramifications far outnumber the reasons to pass along their plan. The analogy can be made for people as it is for dogs, the less "space" in a park, the more agitated people and or dogs may become. Dogs do not have the same reasoning and decision making we do, and therefore dogs will become more territorial and dog fights will become epidemic. Not only dog fighting, and barking creating constant noise problems for local residents, but all fights may lead to humans be injured.
Organization: SuperDog City, LLC
Commenter: Corey M Vitale **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5522 **Comment Id:** 363896 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The majority of dog behavioral issues stem from lack of exercise. Banning the ability for a dog to run free, off-leash WILL increase the number of aggressive dogs who are unstable. These animals will be more likely to bite children and other dogs, among other issues.
Organization:
Commenter: Julie N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5523 **Comment Id:** 363898 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'd like to strongly advocate the importance of keeping our public areas open to off leash dog walking and play. Though others may find this an annoyance or danger it is a very important aspect in a dogs health and happiness.
Organization:
Commenter: Leila Sarikey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5528 **Comment Id:** 363902 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Whatever objections there may be to off-leash dogs- -or dogs' presence in certain areas, period- -the fact is that living among thousands of pent-up, frustrated dogs who are not allowed to run and play properly cannot possibly be a desirable consequence of limiting exercise areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Rachel N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5531 **Comment Id:** 363908 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash exercise and play is healthy for both the dog and the owner and also increases the owner/dog bond allowing a dog to become a balanced and healthy member of society.
Organization:
Commenter: Apryl A Guisasola **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5550 **Comment Id:** 363934 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Besides taking a much loved freedom away from dogs and their guardians, citizens of this fair city, disallowing off leash activity in these areas will over crowd city parks, as well as the city shelters with dogs that are unmanageable without getting regular vigorous exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: Lindsey Sheehy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5551 **Comment Id:** 363936 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: To remove the very few trails and spaces that our dogs can com along on would be detrimental to all of us, not just our pets. It is often the dogs that help us out of the house everyday for a much needed walk/hike.
Organization:
Commenter: Maria C Ask-Hed **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5558 **Comment Id:** 363942 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Having places like Fort Funston to walk Wilbur off leash is honestly one of the contributing factors as to why I chose to remain living in SF and buy a home and start a family. It is a huge part of our lives. I walk there, I pick up trash along the way, while Wilbur gets the necessary exercise and socialization he needs to remain a physically and emotionally happy dog. Please save off leash dog space. My happiness depends on it.
Organization:
Commenter: Rebecca M Dworkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5562 **Comment Id:** 363949 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs, like humans, need to interact with each other in order to build social skills. These areas currently being discussed are the perfect venues for such doggie

intermingling.
Organization:
Commenter: Rick Matsuno **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5563 **Comment Id:** 363953 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is not hard to see how unfair and unhealthy this would be to such gentle creatures whose sole purpose in life often seems only to love us.
Organization:
Commenter: Meredith Preble **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5579 **Comment Id:** 363962 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We rely on the exercise and scenery to keep us active and agile. Being a shelter dog was tough on my dog. She does not do well in confined spaces such as a dog parks. She feels safest in open spaces and shows a profound change of character when at one of 'her' beaches. And because I'm out there enjoying my time with her this GGNRA proposal would in a real sense take away this space/exercise for me.
Organization:
Commenter: Dorothy R Adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5581 **Comment Id:** 363964 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not ban off lease dog play in the Bay Area. We have a large, thriving dog community here in San Francisco. It gives us the opportunity to socialize our dogs and exercise them in ways most other dense urban environments can't. It promotes healthy dogs and healthy people but getting both man and dog out and active.
Organization:
Commenter: Ryan M Sprinkle **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5605 **Comment Id:** 363996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Kali Kraum **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5618 **Comment Id:** 364016 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need to be socialized in order to keep them happy, healthy and most importantly human safe. They need to know how to interact safely with humans and especially children. Off leash areas are important in the development of good dog behaviors.

Organization:

Commenter: Kevin F Cubba **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5621 **Comment Id:** 364019 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: believe dogs need space to run and play and socialize with other dogs. They need the recreation areas to stay free from strict leash laws, as they are now.

Organization:

Commenter: jill johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5622 **Comment Id:** 364020 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: But, it is of utmost importance to have dog walking parks in the area that are not city parks. Dog walking is healthier for dogs and individuals. Smaller city parks are not meant as dog use parks. These are small facilities meant for family use for picnics, games, parties where dog use is only a nuisance. In more open areas, dog are free to excersize and socialize as are their owners. I am not a dog owner, but I clearly see the need and benefit to continue open use of recreational parks and beaches for dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Dobra **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5627 **Comment Id:** 364031 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: People and animals need socialization and outdoor open space areas in which to exercise and appreciate the beauty of nature. I urge you to leave the long-standing dog rules in place and make minor / reasonable repairs and updates while still allowing off-leash activities in those areas currently de facto used for that purpose

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5630 **Comment Id:** 364033 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My husband and I have two dogs that have become well socialized, gentle, and happy dogs because I have been taking them to Ft. Funston on a more or less daily basis. The fact that they can run, play, and visit unencumbered has made a huge difference to them as well as us. I strongly urge you to allow us to continue exercising them as well as us at this most marvelous of places.

Organization:
Commenter: Reinhold Gras **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5633 **Comment Id:** 364050 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Given the current data that suggests the importance and attachment of these creatures both to us, and us to them, further restriction will cause backlash from all involved in pet care sectors. Pets desperately need adopting from shelters. If restrictions continue with regard to when/where these pets are allowed, it will become too much trouble to adopt them and the mortality rate at shelters in the area will SKY ROCKET. In addition, pets with less exercise in their daily routine develop behavioral problems and will likely be given up/destroyed. For what?
Organization:
Commenter: Hilary Gross **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5644 **Comment Id:** 364064 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog I think that turning the off leash area into a restrictive area will prevent me from recreating with my dog. It will also be detrimental for my dogs health as I rely on that open space for my dog to run and exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: Nia Reate **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5647 **Comment Id:** 364066 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog is very small and is not comfortable when we go to the designated gated parks throughout the City. He is overwhelmed with dogs, many of which are aggressive.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5649 **Comment Id:** 364071 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Pets deserve to be able to walk freely without a leash in open air environments. This activity encourages them to be healthy and learn to socialize with other people and animals without becoming violent or afraid.
Organization:
Commenter: Troy H **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5651 **Comment Id:** 364075 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Fenced in pens with no open space alternative confine large groups in a small

space. Many dogs are fearful or aggressive in confined spaces with unkown dogs present; these pens would encourage irresponsible dog owners to never teach voice commands while simultaneously keeping responsible dog owners away who fear for their dog's health at the hands of others.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Pecevich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5675 **Comment Id:** 364109 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We need off-leash play areas in SF. I love taking my dogs to SF to the beach and to parks. Please keep off-leash areas for dogs to play fetch. It's good for their health and mine.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Novak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5685 **Comment Id:** 364149 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is very important to socialize dogs like pitbulls, German Shepherds, huskies, etc. and if all interactions from a young age were stressful, on-leash encounters, I think more dogs would be aggressive when meeting other dogs out for a walk, pulling and barking and snapping. All that aside, the quality of life of many San Franciscans and their dogs will be greatly diminished by strict leash-laws, and the cost of enforcing it seems a bit ridiculous. We'd much rather have the parks nicely maintained, and let dog owners continue to do their own dog management as we have done for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Louise B Rousseau **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5686 **Comment Id:** 364150 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our dogs need the opportunity to run and frolic. I think that a survey of Montara residents would show overwhelming support for off leash areas for our dogs. Please consider the wishes of the majority and the health and well being of the dogs that live in Montara.

Organization:

Commenter: Liam A Durkee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5710 **Comment Id:** 364173 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This a very short sited thing to do that will affect the lifes of thousands of people and their dogs. If this restriction passed we will be losing almost all areas that we have to give our dogs room to run and be healthy.

Organization:
Commenter: Julian N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5719 **Comment Id:** 364183 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please don't take away off-leash play areas! This is going to be terrible for dogs!
Organization:
Commenter: David Wells **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5728 **Comment Id:** 364192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreational activity with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years
Organization:
Commenter: Kelly M Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5748 **Comment Id:** 364230 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My family and I have a 120 pound dog that is still growing. The only space for activity our dog recieves is at fort funston and at stern grove's dog park. In these areas we are allowed to train our one year old puppy to be off leash, play fetch, and learn to socialize with dogs of all breeds and sizes. Without these abilities, my puppy will not be able to learn to behave civilized. He needs an outlet to release all his doggy needs and to ban such spaces is good reason for more dogs on sidewalks, placed in dog pounds, abandoned, even worse-confined.
Organization:
Commenter: Cassandra Ngo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5751 **Comment Id:** 364236 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need vigorous exercise and they can only get such off-leash. I am an active person, but with a bad knee that prevents me from running. My dog needs to run and he can only do that under voice control, off-leash. It is distressing to see so many limitations on where dogs can be off-leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Gahry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5753 **Comment Id:** 364240 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs, as humans, need to have freedom to move around, to run, to socialize. On leash, this won't be possible anymore. A dog can't run on leash, can't fetch on leash, can't swim on leash, can be himself on leash. I find really hard and cruel not to have open spaces for dogs to exercise in the way they have to.

Organization:

Commenter: AlÃcia Rius **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5758 **Comment Id:** 364255 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What could you be thinking? Have innocent animals not suffered enough through this rescission caused by humans? Our funding diminished, shelters full, no processes in place for spay neuter to reduce overpopulation causing millions to die each year, most in deplorable conditions and now we can't even have the space to walk and play with the dogs that are fortunate enough to have homes or be in foster care? Please reconsider.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa Williams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5759 **Comment Id:** 364256 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please reconsider your decision I beg you! My dog lives for running and swimming along Fort Funston and Crissy Field. It's hard having an animal in such a small apartment, and the only way she can release her pent up energy is to run freely along the shore. Unfortunately, my dog does not enjoy enclosed dog parks so I rely on places such as Fort Funston and Crissy.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5785 **Comment Id:** 364299 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Nothing better than allowing you and your dog to run free in these selected areas of San Francisco. I so enjoy meeting and talking to other dog owners. We are happy there which creates a happy vibe which means we treat the areas well! Please don't do this to us ~ we need the wide open spaces for our health and our doggies health!!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5788 **Comment Id:** 364302 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is nothing, and I mean nothing, more enjoyable to our exceptionally friendly 8 year old Corgi (and few things more enjoyable to us, her people) than cavorting in the

surf with a tennis ball at the 'dog approved' area of north Stinson Beach. She loves to say hello to people and, of course, go get that ball. And it really is the highpoint of her existence. Please, please, please don't take that away from her. And from us.

Organization:

Commenter: Josh Lebowitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5806 **Comment Id:** 364338 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Proper exercise is very important for a dog's health, and my companionship with my dog is an important part of my own pursuit of happiness as a resident of San Francisco. I believe the new plan reduces my right to enjoy living in my city, for reasons that have not been scientifically substantiated or are simply administrative over-reach.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Zimmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5823 **Comment Id:** 364362 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please let pet owners have a place to allow our pets to run free and happy. It is important that as long as the world has domesticated dogs, that we treat them the way they were intended to live- running fast and free. We can not do this on streets with cars, in schools with children, at parks with people and kids and food, but we can at Fort Funston. Taking our dog to Fort Funston has been the best thing not only for our dogs mental and physical health, but it also brings our entire family together.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda R Spira **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5828 **Comment Id:** 364367 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Imagine all the pent up energy and not being able to run and play. If you change the current rules my dogs who love to swim will be unable to do so. They are hurting no fish and no nature when they swim and cannot see any damage they do to sand on a beach. Incidents of bad dog behavior are very infrequent and most mean dog owners do not bring their animals to places like this.

Organization:

Commenter: William Shore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5834 **Comment Id:** 364378 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have

on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Geoff Garinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5841 **Comment Id:** 364384 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Just not fair to SF doggies. They need room to run, it's good for there posture and health.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5852 **Comment Id:** 364413 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Without beach access the only area dog owners can let their dogs roam free also places them at grave risk for a large part of the year: The majority of non-beach dog parks I have visited in the Bay Area are heavily overrun with foxtails from the late spring to early autumn months. Allowing dogs to roam free in these environments puts their health and life at risk.
Organization:
Commenter: George Theodoris **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5853 **Comment Id:** 364416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs and their humans need off leash time and deserve to enjoy the beauty our area has to offer. The health of dogs and their humans rely on this.
Organization:
Commenter: Amy L Allen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5855 **Comment Id:** 364417 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Every years tens of thousands of dogs are put to sleep becuase they don't have homes. Dog friendly people are working hard to bring this number down, but making it more difficult to own a dog by further restricting the places their owners can bring them, is in direct contradiction to this goal. Please don't make this work harder than it already is, please don't give more reasons why saving a dog isn't worth the trouble.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah F Hodges **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5874 **Comment Id:** 364438 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have two dogs of my own who love to play outside. Having areas for dogs offleash means that not only do I get to enjoy my walks but so do my dogs. They get to socialize which also keeps dogs from getting violent.

Organization:

Commenter: Shirlee Ezra **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5879 **Comment Id:** 364453 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A man or woman with their best friend (their canine) should not be restricted from their pursuit of happiness: the ability to enjoy life with one another. Whether it be playing fetch or going on walks, it is ultimately necessary and just simply cruel to restrict pets and their owners from doing so.

Organization:

Commenter: Genevieve Yip **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5884 **Comment Id:** 364460 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog is very sweet but gets incredibly nervous when on a leash. Furthermore, it is important that she (and I) get enough exercise, which can be very difficult since I can work long hours. Fenced in areas never allow for enough exercise, for either me or my pup.

Organization:

Commenter: Mantissa Johnston **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5886 **Comment Id:** 364466 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have two service dogs which I take to Crissy Field and Stinson beach daily. These places give my dogs and myself pure bliss and fun. I suffer from fibromyalgia and anxiety. These areas allow my dogs to get the proper exercise they need to fulfill their happy yet short lives.

Organization:

Commenter: Shannan McDermott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5891 **Comment Id:** 364470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In fact it is already quite difficult to find nearby opportunities for off-leash walking in most places. Further reduction of these areas will cause suffering for both dog owners and dogs and are unnecessary. Raising healthy dogs requires giving them opportunities to roam and explore in a natural fashion.

Organization:

Commenter: Stefan Amshey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364481 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I used to also frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command, less now, because they are too crowded, my dog feels more tense, there's not enough room to exercise, and they cause more stress to both me and my dog, rather than relaxation.
Organization:
Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5893 **Comment Id:** 364489 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Again, for these and a multitude of other reasons, this legislation is a waste of time & money, and will prevent dogs from getting the essential exercise and interaction needed for them to continue to live happily in the San Francisco area.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne Schnobrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5898 **Comment Id:** 364499 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If the only places left for us are over-crowded dog parks, so much of the joy of dog ownership will be taken from both dog and owner, because both dogs and humans need exercise and the joy of variety of experience for health and happiness.
Organization:
Commenter: Elisabeth Weir **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5904 **Comment Id:** 364509 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It's incredibly important for us to have an area where our dog can be off leash. When living in a city like San Francisco there are few areas where our dog ran cut loose and run around and enjoy himself. It's vital to their well being that these places stay off-leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Hannah Nygaard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5941 **Comment Id:** 364767 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs provide so much love and support to humans in so many ways; they need places to run free. And remember A TIRED DOG IS A WELL BEHAVED DOG.
Organization:

Commenter: Vivien MacDonald **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5950 **Comment Id:** 364774 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The off-leash areas area valuable resource for those of us with canine companions, and we all endeavor to maintain a respectful relationship with other park users. Animals certainly also deserve consideration in use of public spaces; conservation efforts are a clear global good, and so is maintaining awareness that even 'domestic' creatures have certain needs to maintain emotional and physical health and well being.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5951 **Comment Id:** 364778 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dogs are happiest when they can walk outdoors with their owners and be off leash. I strongly urge you to keep the remaining dog friendly off leash trails available for our use.
Organization:
Commenter: Lori D Fineman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5952 **Comment Id:** 364779 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please keep Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, etc. available to dogs to run off leash! This is necessary for all San Francisco dogs to stay exercised and socialized.
Organization:
Commenter: Asa C Nojd **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5966 **Comment Id:** 364828 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need exercise every day and urban residents with busy schedules may not have more than one opportunity to exercise outside. If that time is with a dog - - under your plan - - it will be less likely to be in the GGNRA
Organization:
Commenter: Gary Beberman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5968 **Comment Id:** 364829 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: closing off leash areas in the way you are proposing is unfair to the thousands of San Franciscans who exercise their dogs. Off leash play is essential to the well being of the animal. PLEASE reconsider your measures.

Organization: Wonder Dog Rescue
Commenter: Wonder Dog Rescue **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5975 **Comment Id:** 364845 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Without a place for my dog to run around safely, our quality of lives (and our neighbors) will plummet to an unacceptable level. Inadequate levels of exercise lead to behavioral problems, which will ultimately disturb the peace for many San Francisco residents (barking, property destruction, etc.).
Organization:
Commenter: Laura A Kelso **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5979 **Comment Id:** 364847 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Even more wonderful for the dog and the dog owner is watching dogs play off leash. Dogs need to be socialized as they are pack animals and want to be with each other. Playing together gives them exercise, enjoyment and lets off tension and stress, just like it does for humans. Fort Funston is a treasure for dogs to romp and play and has been for decades now. I have taken my dogs and friends dogs to this place and never have I seen problems with playing and getting along
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Cappa **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6005 **Comment Id:** 364882 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need to run off leash. To be free and to release pent up energy. Without that ability to release, they can sufffer, just as humans do when they are kept restrained.
Organization:
Commenter: sarah jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6006 **Comment Id:** 364887 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks frequently with both family dogs , I feel that turning the off leash area into a restrictive area will prevent me from recreating with our dogs. It will also be detrimental for my dogs' health as I rely on that open space for them to run and exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6014 **Comment Id:** 364959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having room to run without being on leash is important for the health of our dogs. It's also good for the health of humans because it usually involves much more walking on the part of people than going to the small areas designated as off leash. Being able to play off leash is not only important for the physical health of dogs, but also their mental health as well. The same for the people who walk them, live with them.

Organization:

Commenter: Cecil Myers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6016 **Comment Id:** 364961 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have a huge goldendoodle puppy. The only way for him to get enough exercise is to run around off leash and play with other dogs. I can power walk our puppy for 6 miles (trust me, I've tried) and it's just not enough exercise. He needs to run and wrestle with other dogs or else he's a little hellion at home. Plus, the ability to run around and play with other dogs is what gives dogs a great quality of life. Dogs can't have or do any of this if they have to remain on a leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6019 **Comment Id:** 364965 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the new altered restrictions for off leash restrictions at Fort Funston and Crissy Field. I walk my Golden retriever daily at Fort Funston for the sake of his need to exercise and socialize- -as well as mine! I meet people of all walks of life and socio-economic levels and I see the extremely important benefit of the social interaction that a place like Fort Funston provides

Organization:

Commenter: Mary M Guerra **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6023 **Comment Id:** 364972 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Open parks for dogs are important for not just the dogs but their owners as well. They are important for happy healthy socialized dogs

Organization:

Commenter: Ric West **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6028 **Comment Id:** 364996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Francisco is a dense, urban environment (as is the entire Bay Area). Dog owners need open spaces to recreate with our dogs for our own health and the health of our animal companions. San Francisco has more dogs than children, and certainly dog owners have

GGNRA161256

just as much need for healthy recreation as families with kids, not to mention families with kids and dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Rhodes Klement **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6047 **Comment Id:** 365243 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Forcing dogs to live their lives at the end of a leash is inhumane. And the very real concern that dogs need to be able to socialize and play in off-leash areas in order to be well-adjusted canine citizens should be given serious thought, as it is of particular significance in a densely populated setting such as San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6049 **Comment Id:** 365251 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Well-exercised dogs and their people are healthy and better adjusted. Responsible dog people recognize that safe, off-leash freedom in our crowded parks and beaches comes with requirements: dog training and socialization, cleaning up all waste, respecting others' rights and well-being.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia S Adler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6065 **Comment Id:** 365293 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I currently am part of a task force for Burlingame/Hillsborough looking to revamp the dog parks, but if the dogs are unable to be off lease such as you are planning, the dog parks will be over run with too many dogs and puts all the animals at risk for disease.

Organization:

Commenter: Charlotte M Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6068 **Comment Id:** 365296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For this reason, I am writing to express my significant opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It restricts the area to off leash dog walking way too strictly and will have detrimental effects on both my health and that of my dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Kiley M Nichols **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6111 **Comment Id:** 365426 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I urge you to reconsider this ill-conceived plan. We are counting on you to be able to exercise both ourselves and our dog responsibly.
Organization:
Commenter: Julie S Ryan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6123 **Comment Id:** 365493 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Celene Matthews **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6129 **Comment Id:** 365519 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: please allow dogs that are well mannered and listen to play off leash in the water near the beach. We are responsible dog owners. Our dog loves to run in the water and fetch the ball as he is part Lab. He never bothers any other people or wild life. His day on the beach is as important to him as it is to the kids.
Organization:
Commenter: DAVID K kiely **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6131 **Comment Id:** 365526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I recognize the difficulty in trying to please so many diverse user groups. However, as a dog owner, I do not support the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. It will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Raimondo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6358 **Comment Id:** 365799 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Finally, the prospect of funneling off-leash dogs deliberately into the areas shown in the Preferred Alternative would be an enormous risk to the dogs' health, as these areas are full of "foxtails", which are very dangerous to dogs' health. The GGNRA would be acting recklessly to encourage such activity.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6218 **Comment Id:** 366135 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I used to farm and land scape and have a bad back and easily sore arms from working on a computer constantly and my only joy of every day is walking and running my dog off leash, giving us both a great exercise. It is nearly impossible to run with a dog for they need to consistently stop and smell for enjoyment and to catch their breath... running with him off leash allows him to take a break and go to the bathroom and for me to keep on running as well
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6221 **Comment Id:** 366142 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Ours and all dogs need plenty of space to run off leash. Countless reasons that are stated to support maintaining the off leash trails and beaches. To maintain good health dogs need to run hard and the most effective way to run is off leash. Please consider the behavior that may result when our well exercised dogs are denied their rift to run free.....possible bad behavior which may include aggressiveness.
Organization:
Commenter: Louise Selin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6222 **Comment Id:** 366144 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If an owner is not able to take their dog anywhere local to exercise it is not so much that the humans will suffer; it is that the dogs will. If the owner does not have time to take them anywhere out of their way (you know how busy we all are) dogs will not be able to get exercise and would live a very unhappy life. Any dog owner would understand how much your dog's happiness means to you and if their dog cannot be happy (it can be very hard to see a dog be unhappy) owners might feel as if they did not do a good job caring for their pet.
Organization:
Commenter: Laila C LoRe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6222 **Comment Id:** 366145 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I believe dogs should be able to roam in parks to remain strong and healthy. If dogs don't get the energy that their bodies require, it can lead to behavior issues. In conclusion, if parks and trails no longer let dogs roam and get the exercise that their bodies need, it can result in aggressive behavior, unhealthiness, and most importantly unhappiness. If dogs can roam free, these things have a better chance of not occurring.

Organization:
Commenter: Laila C LoRe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6229 **Comment Id:** 366148 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs benefit greatly from the recreational opportunities at the GGNRA and their humans gain an immense amount from their companionship and well-being, especially in a gorgeous natural setting.
Organization:
Commenter: Jay Kammen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6240 **Comment Id:** 366163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If we are limited to one small area, I will be forced to simply watch my dog play, instead of getting exercise with her. I have many, many friends and neighbors who feel the same way. Unfortunately, living in a densely populated city, this is the only way for me and my dog to get great exercise and enjoy time together.
Organization:
Commenter: Nicole D H **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6241 **Comment Id:** 366170 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Having moved here from NYC, I truly appreciate access to offleash space and believe it is a critical component in keeping dogs healthy, and well socialized.
Organization:
Commenter: Christine B Brumback **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6246 **Comment Id:** 366189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I begin with the public health impact. Every owner knows "a tired dog is a happy dog," and many people like me are urban residents who rely on these GGNRA areas to give ourselves and our dogs the daily exercise they require for our physical and mental health and socialization. Your Plan would impose an undue burden on SF dog owners for whom daily commuting to some remote rural location to allow their dogs to run freely while under voice control would be prohibitive. Dog ownership helps promote the public health and well-being, and the GGNRA serves as an important resource for Bay Area residents with and without dogs in this context, especially in the current areas where off leash walking is permitted.
Organization:
Commenter: Rhonda Vitanye **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6261 **Comment Id:** 366316 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog walking and dog play are more than just healthy human recreation. Dog walking and dog play are a daily, bona fide need for families that include dogs as family members. Many responded to pleas by organizations like San Francisco's world-famous SPCA to adopt dogs. As responsible animal and nature lovers, we will fulfill our commitment to care for our recreational needs and the needs of our canine companions one way or another.

Organization: Dogpatch Dogs

Commenter: Carma J Keats **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6268 **Comment Id:** 366367 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not reduce the area available for off leash dog walking in the GGNRA. Our dogs need s place to play and interact with each other and the environment. On-lease walking does not provide the same quality of exercise for our pets, which is essential for their happiness, health and wellbeing.

Organization:

Commenter: Miles Pickering **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6283 **Comment Id:** 366413 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am now 66 years old now and have severe arthritis so I can no longer walk fast. If my current dog (a rescue from San Francisco's city animal shelter) is to get any decent exercise she needs to run off leash. I cannot possibly give her enough exercise on a leash. What are people like me to do?

Organization:

Commenter: Carolyn H Lucas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6287 **Comment Id:** 366425 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs (and owners) in the other highly urban, only leashed dog environments, yields more neurotic behavior including fighting, biting, social inappropriateness and other behaviors not normally seen when dogs are allowed to run around; running around naturally occurring trees, hills, up and down dunes, running into the water, etc. These are happy dogs. They support happy owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Seth Feigenbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6290 **Comment Id:** 366443 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog gets so much enjoyment from being off-leash especially at the beach

swimming in the waves. And from that my family gets so much enjoyment. Many times, strangers enjoy my dog also. Countless times we have had a stranger pick up the ball and throw it into the waves for my dog and the it is amazing the joy it gives them.

Organization:

Commenter: Maya Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6291 **Comment Id:** 366449 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need the option to swim for exercise. Swimming is a good exercise and not hard on joints. We often take our dog to the beach at Crissy Field. It's her favorite place to go and she wears herself out swimming and running. It's also relaxing and enjoyable for us to walk along the beach with our dog. We've met some very nice dogs and dog owners when the dogs play and chase each other running down the beach. Many people are not able to run with their dogs, especially older people, so there needs to be a place where the dogs can safely run or swim off leash. Dogs that have sufficient exercise are better behaved.

Organization:

Commenter: D Cibilich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6292 **Comment Id:** 366452 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Most dogs are more well-behaved and trained than the majority of children under 19 years old, they really need to get there energy out running about, otherwise, there will be more issues to deal with.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6297 **Comment Id:** 366465 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Humans ask a lot of their animals and a small reward is the joy of running freely on the beach with their people. I think this helps pets stay healthy physically and mentally.

Organization:

Commenter: Victoria Roberts-Russell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6609 **Comment Id:** 367174 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm highly concerned about the proposed leash-only areas and am wondering what the ramifications will be? How many altercations will ensue? How crowded will the off-leash parks around me become? Whan about parking? How will my dog get her exercise? How will I get my exercise? The questions are endless. The reasons to pass the plan are few and unproven.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Schulting **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6619 **Comment Id:** 367257 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a dog owner training dogs hours every week for agility competitions, I agree that on-leash activity is an essential part of a dog training regime. However, it is also accepted that off-leash socialization with other dogs is critical for the development of a non-aggressive, well-balanced dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Russ Pritchett **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6625 **Comment Id:** 367491 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I want dogs to be safe and behave. Dog walkers could be the best dogs in the world because they have lot of exerise they did. My dog could not be safe at the parks because thier were lot of jerks. going on over there. Dogs would never be irresponsible no more because you have to teach them to do exerise. I think dogs could be safe at GGNRA because don't just let them be alone.
Organization:
Commenter: Nyarini Faavone **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6630 **Comment Id:** 367508 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I take my dog, who is well behaved, to Crissy Field, Fort Funston Ocean Beach to run. If he had to be leased neither of us would get people exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: Francine Fillice **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368094 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We exercise in these areas with our dog off leash and under voice control for both our own health as well as the health of our dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6643 **Comment Id:** 368163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog is only allowed to swim for exercise because she has a problem with her elbows so she is not supposed to walk or play on hard surfaces. I am a good swimmer but not as good as Zoe! She has to swim off leash.

Organization:
Commenter: Alexander O'Driscoll **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368226 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRAs new draft management plan. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dogs health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6652 **Comment Id:** 368242 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I want dogs to be free! There is no proof that dogs are causing damage. Dogs need exercise and if they are cooped up all the time it is possible that they could incessantly might misbehave. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe and not all dog owners are irresponsible
Organization:
Commenter: Jada N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6653 **Comment Id:** 368243 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing because this new law is not fair, people need to walk their dogs! I'm a dog owner my self and I know for a fact if dogs say cooped up in a small place they will misbehave and not lisen to yo
Organization:
Commenter: Janal N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6656 **Comment Id:** 368249 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Our dog Sam is a gentle black lab who loves to swim and play ball. He needs his exercise to stay healthy. Coincidentally, this regular exercise keeps me fit and healthy as well.
Organization:
Commenter: Joan M Kaplan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6656 **Comment Id:** 368252 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Your preferred alternative will significantly alter the quality of my life and the life of my dog, Sam. Spending time at the beach with Sam provides me with an opportunity to

get to know my neighbors.
Organization:
Commenter: Joan M Kaplan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6679 **Comment Id:** 368258 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing because I don't like the new law because a dog that not exercise might misbehave. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe. Not all dog owners are irresponsible.
Organization:
Commenter: Mariana na **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6573 **Comment Id:** 368275 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The dogs are an important part of that - the fact that within the city limits a dog owner can let his dog run free along the sandy beach, romp in the water, play with other dogs, is a source of delight to me, to their owners - and to the doggies themselves.
Organization:
Commenter: Eleanor G Burke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2532 **Comment Id:** 368679 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The value of spending time with one's best friend off leash in nature without breaking any laws is crucial to human and canine health and wellness. I am a psychotherapist by trade and can testify to the power of both animal assisted therapy and nature's positive impact on those who suffer.
Organization:
Commenter: Linda Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4506 **Comment Id:** 368681 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking my dog improves both my dog's and my physical and mental health. My dog is an SF SPCA certified Animal Assisted Therapy dog. Exercise is an important part of her daily routine, both walking with me and occasionally with her dog walker. Access to the GGNRA for this highly social activity is an important aspect of the quality of life in San Francisco.
Organization:
Commenter: kathryn Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6549 **Comment Id:** 368702 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'am writing because Dogs and Dog Walkers Keep parks safe and all dogs need to get exercise if they don't the dogs might misbehave.

Organization:

Commenter: Maurice Ali **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6529 **Comment Id:** 368710 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: With limited living space in San Francisco, the parks are all we have to exercise our dogs. Playing fetch, going for a run on leash/or off is vital to so majority of dog owners.The proposed changes will greatly impact the quality of life not only my dog but also myself and family.

Organization:

Commenter: M Mccright **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369491 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It should be noted that the City and County of San Francisco has an ordinance (San Francisco City and County Health Code; Article I; Section 41.12; Paragraph (c); Subparagraph 5) that, among other things, requires dog guardians to provide their dogs with adequate exercise to maintain muscle mass and appropriate weight. Therefore, the issue of whether or not to exercise dogs when access has become severely restricted is not optional. Dog guardians will be forced to do what they have to in order to comply with San Francisco health code law.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6659 **Comment Id:** 369499 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A dog that is not exercised might misbehave.

Organization:

Commenter: Irianna Morales **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6668 **Comment Id:** 369509 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I frequently go to Fort Funston to let my dog play, run, and socialize off leash. It is a joy to see dogs and their owners enjoying each other in such a free environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Kuntz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6580 **Comment Id:** 369513 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs need a lot of exercise from running and socializing in order to behave, and the best way for them to get this is by being off-leash. A good, respectful dog is a tired dog, and one that is treated well; pet parents cant provide that if their options are limited.

Organization:

Commenter: Gina Symczak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/28/2014)

CB1100 Comments Regarding the Monitoring Based Management Strategy (Substantive)

1. **Commenters are concerned about the ability of the NPS to effectively protect resources through the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy, as compliance goals and details of monitoring are not expressed.**

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368432 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: One of the most troubling developments in the SEIS is the proposed monitoring-based management strategy, under which Park Service staff will monitor noncompliance and impacts to natural resources and propose mitigation measures at a later date, instead of using automatic triggers that were originally proposed. This development is clearly the result of lobbying and political pressure and does not have any factual relevance. The previous target for 75% compliance was itself far too low to have any meaningful impact on protecting visitor experience or natural resources. Such a compliance level would not change the type and degree of risks to visitors exposed to off-leash activity, as described above under Visitor Safety.
Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6459 **Comment Id:** 368531 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The entire success of this plan lies in the concept now referred to as the monitoring based management strategy. If this management strategy fails, these rules become meaningless, and we are not just back where we started, but worse. We understand the problem posed by picking a 75% lvel of compliance measured by violations, which we already suggested were too lax. We are encouraged that the monitoring will look at sites more comprehensively, and in particular paying attention to habitat destruction or other impairment of park resources. We are frustrated, however, that the details of the monitoring plan have yet to be developed, so must yet have to go through yet another public planning process.
Organization: San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Commenter: Steven Krefting **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

2. **Several comments offered suggestions for the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy to strengthen the strategy, such as community outreach and education and better enforcement of the regulations.**

Correspondence Id: 5631 **Comment Id:** 364039 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The revised Monitoring-Based Management Strategy is less rigid than the previous compliance-based strategy, which did not consider the trail context. Nonetheless, given the size and diverse conditions of GGNRA and a limited number of personnel, the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy needs to be supported by clear standards and vigorous enforcement that includes (a) visible increase in uniformed law enforcement presence; (b) increased issuance of citations, particularly to aggressive violators; and (c) tracking of repeat offenders. We agree with others that enforcement of regulations sends the clearest message to people about what is expected of them. Clear and prominent signage is also important.

Organization: Marin Conservation League

Commenter: Jon Elam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6596 **Comment Id:** 369628 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The proposed "compliance-based" approach should be modified to create a baseline of current conditions, and then measure impacts rather than compliance. It should include a robust public educational component and an objective, long-term monitoring program designed and carried out with the community. The GGNRA should develop partnerships with community, animal welfare, and conservation organizations to make this work. These partner groups could bring additional resources to limited federal resources. GGNRA should be a partner with the City of San Francisco and other communities, not an adversary.

Organization:

Commenter: Timothy Sinclair **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Commenters are concerned about the amount of research that will be done to create the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy. Commenters are concerned about the number of dogs that would be displaced from GGNRA and into local dog parks, and the additive effects from different sources (e.g., dogs, people, and climate change) on the park's resources.

Correspondence Id: 1447 **Comment Id:** 352575 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The report includes a section about monitoring-based management strategy. That strategy includes monitoring the number of dogs and dog walkers, among other items. Has any monitoring of the number of dogs (in general, not only for commercial dog walkers) been done as part of the research for the plan? If only 25 dogs use Fort Funston on a day, it's not a problem to relocate those dogs to other city parks. But what happens when hundreds of dogs are relocated? Or thousands? The potential for aggressive incidents increases dramatically if a large number of dogs are relocated to a smaller area.

Organization:

Commenter: Gina Luzzi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4005 **Comment Id:** 368804 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The Monitoring Program (summarized on page 63 of the SDEIS) is an important part of the plan. Thank you for working on improvements to the former version of this element. While improved, it needs more work. For example, it does not address identifying or distinguishing impacts from dogs and from other causes, such as human (e.g., disturbance) or natural impacts (e.g., climate change). This is fundamental to a scientifically valid monitoring and management program. For example, if there is more than one cause - such as people and dogs in a seasonally-restricted wildlife area - any proposed management action should deal with the relevant causes, rather than basing management actions on one cause that may not address the problem. The public should be able to comment on the appropriate response. An objective monitoring program - based on maintaining long-standing urban recreational uses per GGNRA's organic act â€“ should respond to the data and should allow restoring and increasing dog walking areas, not simply restricting them.

Organization:

Commenter: Kenneth S Weiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. **There are concerns that the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy would be based solely on compliance with leash laws, not on impacts to the park's resources. Some commenters are concerned the GGNRA managers would change regulations based on compliance without public input on the changes; however, other commenters recognize that the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy calls for public review and comments. Commenters do not feel that the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy is a significant improvement over the Compliance-Based Management Strategy of the DEIS.**

Correspondence Id: 1011 **Comment Id:** 351427 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Organization:

Commenter: David Nale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6101 **Comment Id:** 365415 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am opposed to the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the previous Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The strategy is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions and there are no thresholds for violations or other conditions that would trigger any change in status even if on a temporary basis. The plan allows the GGNRA to unilaterally make additional closures without providing meaningful descriptions of the conditions and metrics that would warrant such actions; these changes in use would not be subject to a requirement that public review and input be obtained. Any compliance based plan needs to be adequately developed with sufficient detail to enable meaningful public comment.

Organization:
Commenter: Dave Emanuel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366238 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I also oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy (MBMS) described in the SEIS, which I feel is not a significant improvement over the Compliance-Based Management Strategy outlined in the 2011 DEIS. The MBMS is still a subjective system that gives GGNRA staff unchecked decision-making power over what constitutes unacceptable levels of compliance and what can trigger long- and short-term closures of areas of the GGNRA to dogs. There is no requirement to present scientific evidence or to prove negative impacts have occurred nor this there a sufficient mechanism for the public to appeal such a decision, both of which are necessary parts of a fair monitoring policy.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369455 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS presents a "new and improved" Management Strategy which they euphemistically call "Monitoring Based Management Strategy". This new scheme purportedly addresses the comments/ concerns of the public regarding the DEIS. The DEIS plan is in italics above. The SEIS plan is essentially the same except that it modifies the portion of the Management Strategy First, the discussion of compliance rates has changed from 75% to "deemed unacceptable". Respectfully, this is even worse! We now have a measure of compliance that is totally subjective, with the GGNRA making all the decisions. This is unacceptable. Further, these short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which we have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston, and surprise- -dogs are now banned. Worse, the language indicates a long term closure would likely require a special regulation. The entire concept of "compliance based management strategy" is one that has never before been utilized in any other National Park or National Recreation Area by the NPS. The Draft Plan/DEIS states (page 1725) that "the compliance-based management strategy is an important and effective tool to manage uncertainty when proposing new action" and "has been created" to assure successful implementation and long-term sustainability. We argued this policy attempts to allow the implementation of future restrictions without public notice and comment. This is unlawful and should never have been included in the DEIS. We were correct - - so they changed the Management Strategy to include public notice and comment, but their intent has not changed. Because history has shown the GGNRA has their own agenda and cares little about the science or public comment, this SEIS version of a Management Strategy is every bit as much of a poison pill as the original version in the DEIS.
Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 35 **Comment Id:** 337997 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My chief concern with the previous draft was the provision that allowed the NPS to degrade off-leash 'ROLA' areas to on-leash or banning dogs entirely without further public consultation. The latest draft has removed this language, but the new 'Monitoring-Based Management Strategy' doesn't strike me as a material improvement. The compliance section of this strategy begins with focused enforcement of regulations and education. It should stop there. Instead it goes on to mention buffer zones, time and use restrictions, and SUP restrictions and then goes on to short-term closures that are typically one-year or less. While the previous draft was worse, the prospect of losing access to the limited off-leash areas that will remain after the implementation of this plan for a year or possubly more isn't a material improvement. Please remove the language around further regulating, restricting, permitting and closing the ROLA areas. Focus on enforcement and use your limited resources to handle the minority of irresponsible dog owners rather than closing down access for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert D Ellison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1012 **Comment Id:** 351430 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Organization:

Commenter: Lawrence Skaggs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1121 **Comment Id:** 351677 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah Breivis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1257 **Comment Id:** 352184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the

Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Natasha Joseph **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1275 **Comment Id:** 352224 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Monitoring Based Management Strategy is again a poison pill. This proposed compliance strategy has a measure of compliance that is totally subjective, with the GGNRA making all the decisions. Further, short or long term (permanent) closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA. It appears the language is designed to allow the GGNRA to make most or all of Fort Funston a native plant restoration/habitat, despite the fact that this is inconsistent with the enabling legislation and MOU with SF.

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1285 **Comment Id:** 352243 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose what the GGNRA calls the "Preferred Alternative" and instead I urge formalization of the 1979 pet policy.I oppose the "Preferred Alternative" for many reasons: it's too restrictive for both current and future GGNRA lands, the Monitoring-Based Management strategy is too easy to misuse, and a number of other reasons.

Organization:

Commenter: James D Raymond **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1288 **Comment Id:** 352249 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

Organization:

Commenter: Marie T Kare **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1300 **Comment Id:** 352261 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just

because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeff Osteen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1303 **Comment Id:** 352276 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We don't punish an entire group of people for the actions of a few. If you have money to monitor, you have money to ticket individual law breakers.
Organization:
Commenter: Marya Taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1322 **Comment Id:** 352311 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Lastly I am also opposed to the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version. Allowing GGNRA to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions appears to be very arbitrary and contrary to the democractic process .
Organization:
Commenter: Susan A Garbuio **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1363 **Comment Id:** 352396 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I STRONGLY oppose the monitoring-based management strategy. The GGNRA has no right to change leash statuses.
Organization:
Commenter: Eric Liu **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1414 **Comment Id:** 352510 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Lastly, I would like to formally oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.
Organization:
Commenter: Maya A De La Rosa-Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 609 **Comment Id:** 352719 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: ï¿½ They dont set numerical compliance goals. The first draft of the EIS required a fixed percentage (such as 75%) og owners to comply with the rules, or tougher regulatory measures would automatically kick in. We are concerned that without fixed compliance targets, the new rules will not be enforced.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 614 **Comment Id:** 352732 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: However, there are still significant ways in which the new rules fall short of protecting wildlife: * They do not require fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas. * They allow commercial dog walking with permits, for up to six dogs. * They dont set numerical compliance goals. The first draft of the EIS required a fixed percentage (such as 75%) og owners to comply with the rules, or tougher regulatory measures would automatically kick in. We are concerned that without fixed compliance targets, the new rules will not be enforced.

Organization:

Commenter: Juliet A Lamont **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 661 **Comment Id:** 352845 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Now called the Monitoring-based Management Strategy, the GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE.

Organization: Golden Gate Senior Services, past pres Bd of Directors (23 yrs)

Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 667 **Comment Id:** 352867 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Now called the Monitoring-based Management Strategy, the GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 677 **Comment Id:** 352906 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I'm also opposed to a compliance-based management strategy. This punishes responsible dog owners for the actions of others. If the problem is owners who aren't complying, then the solution should be enforcing the rules and ticketing them instead of permanently closing areas to all dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Barti **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1526 **Comment Id:** 353008 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrea Gibby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 834 **Comment Id:** 353392 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly oppose the SEIS' "Monitoring-based Management Strategy", which is just a mechanism tried earlier that allows GGNRA to decide whether we are in compliance, since the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. This goes against the spirit of the enabling legislation and is totally unacceptable.
Organization:
Commenter: Greg King **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1711 **Comment Id:** 353676 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.
Organization:
Commenter: elizabeth m wiens **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1720 **Comment Id:** 353691 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is unnecessarily restrictive. There is no justification in the plan for such restrictive changes or for creating fenced-in off-leash areas or a Monitoring Based Management Strategy that would allow the GGNRA to arbitrarily change leash status without public comment or opinion.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen Cederlof **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1739 **Comment Id:** 353719 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4668 **Comment Id:** 353842 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. It could raise money for the parks by fining these people.

Organization:

Commenter: Cristina G **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5121 **Comment Id:** 353976 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Organization:

Commenter: Thompson Chambers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2901 **Comment Id:** 355182 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are com plying with the leash restrictions.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Jana Boruta **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2938 **Comment Id:** 355243 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Com pliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on com pliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non- com pliance, it still is prim
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: karen richardson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2945 **Comment Id:** 355253 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The Monitoring-Based Management Strategy is still based largely on com pliance with leash restrictions.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Michael Ng **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2959 **Comment Id:** 355270 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Com pliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on com pliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non- com pliance, it still is primarily focused on mere com pliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non- com pliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Paulina Pchelin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2967 **Comment Id:** 355280 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The MBMS is still based largely on com pliance with leash restrictions.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Katelyn Milinowicz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2970 **Comment Id:** 355285 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Com pliance-Based Management Strategy. it still is primarily focused on mere com pliance with

leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non- com pliance even if no impacts on resources reported.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Michael Miner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2977 **Comment Id:** 355302 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I don't understand how officials who I haven't even voted for are allowed to arbitrarily change policy about how people can use public lands, without any oversight or accountability to the people their policy affects.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Tracy Barsotti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2984 **Comment Id:** 355313 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Com pliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on com pliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non- com pliance, it still is primarily focused on mere com pliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non- com pliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Ketty Mobed **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2986 **Comment Id:** 355320 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Second, procedurally, this attempt by the GGNRA to change the leash status is arbitrary, undemocratic, and very poorly researched.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Steven Armstrong **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3019 **Comment Id:** 355366 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Com pliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on com pliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non- com pliance, it still is primarily focused on mere com pliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non- com pliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: ross tyler bewley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2048 **Comment Id:** 355500 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.
Organization:
Commenter: LaDonna Willems **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3675 **Comment Id:** 355593 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...the SEIS did not do a com plete study, of dog owners, walkers or site specific studies. Their plan and a.lter.nates are TOO restrictive, I oppose the fence ideas and their monitor base management!
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Patti Gilmore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3901 **Comment Id:** 355651 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non- com pliance, it still is primarily focused on mere com pliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non- com pliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Alexis Shoemate **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2092 **Comment Id:** 355683 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose to: THE MONITORING-BASED MGMT STRATEGY THAT REPLACED THE COMPLIANCE-BASED MGMT STRATEGY IN THE EARLIER VERSION OF THE PLAN.
Organization: Self
Commenter: Angela Sharp **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2099 **Comment Id:** 355692 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just

because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2129 **Comment Id:** 355767 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Morgan L Weinert **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4196 **Comment Id:** 355972 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non- com pliance, it still is primarily focused on mere com pliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non- com pliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Philip Sweet **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4471 **Comment Id:** 356007 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non- com pliance, it still is primarily focused on mere com pliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non- com pliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Eric Davidson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2172 **Comment Id:** 356560 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine I Meunier **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2202 **Comment Id:** 356787 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS'

Compliance-Based Management Strategy as the MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew Goforth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2242 **Comment Id:** 356865 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization: Ruby Rieke Design

Commenter: Ruby Rieke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357067 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on 100% cmpliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if it deems park users are in non-compliance. It reserves the right to restrict further dog walking if there are unspecified "violations" or "impacts" in the future. The plan makes inconsistent assumptions and is arbitrary.

Organization:

Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2254 **Comment Id:** 357235 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

Organization:

Commenter: Jessica N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2257 **Comment Id:** 357243 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular

GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Lina Restrepo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2766 **Comment Id:** 357399 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions.

Organization:

Commenter: john cremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2815 **Comment Id:** 357547 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Virginia Gelczis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357568 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Organization:

Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2289 **Comment Id:** 357629 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy as the MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan H Goforth **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2338 **Comment Id:** 357821 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am opposed to the GGNRA Compliance-based Management Strategy regarding off leash and on-leash dog walking in the GGNRA. Compliance based management strategy cannot be part of any plan. This strategywill potentially end off-leash access without giving people a chance to comment on the change. It also punishes responsible dog owners for the bad actions of a few irresponsible ones. It must be removed
Organization:
Commenter: renee f mckenna **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3059 **Comment Id:** 357841 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Emily Coon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3108 **Comment Id:** 357914 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The proposed Complianced-based Management Policy is completely absurd. Why should 75% cmpliance be the threashold? Why should GGNRA have sole evaluation on compliance? Where re the checks and balances? And why should any change be permanent? Where is reciprocity? Is GGRNA willing to have an equivalent clause that states if compliance is > 75% ten area management would be changed to the next LEAST restrictive level (with levels add to include complete non-restriction)? HOW CAN ANYONE READ THIS AND a) THINK THIS PLAN IS FAIR AND BALANCED? and b) NOT REALIZE THE GGNRA'S CLEAR PERMANENT BIAS AGAINST DOGS AND RECREATION?
Organization: SaveOffLeash.com
Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3234 **Comment Id:** 358007 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I do not agree with the proposed ban on off-leash dogs in Bay Area parks.The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Devan Paddock **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3238 **Comment Id:** 358012 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

Organization:

Commenter: Xavier Brouard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3270 **Comment Id:** 358037 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2378 **Comment Id:** 358449 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitored-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Aparna L Reddy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2481 **Comment Id:** 358984 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Annaliese Furnas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2488 **Comment Id:** 358991 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Adryon B Denmark **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2531 **Comment Id:** 359032 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Caitlin Far **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2533 **Comment Id:** 359035 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization: Doggie Do Right Dog Training
Commenter: Sue Minsuk **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3437 **Comment Id:** 359233 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. And this last sentence is the most ignorant offensive piece of law enforcement I have seen in ages. The Federal Government is taking most all GGNRA properties and closing it off to tax paying dog owners because it deems not enough people are complying with leash restrictions. That is what is wrong with your agency.
Organization:
Commenter: Joan House **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3954 **Comment Id:** 360153 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I don't think GGNRA should change the leash status of an area just because people are not complying with existing leash restrictions. Changing rules is not s solution to non-compliance.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4554 **Comment Id:** 360603 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The Monitoring-Based Management Strategy focusses on compliance with

leash restrictions and not on any actual harmful activities.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen Austin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4070 **Comment Id:** 360657 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization: Chihuahua Meet-up
Commenter: Ruth M Chofre **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4629 **Comment Id:** 361148 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not change the leash status simply because not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Russell Ginsberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4099 **Comment Id:** 361280 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas merely because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia E Calfee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4704 **Comment Id:** 361357 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Allison Oropallo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4111 **Comment Id:** 361449 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:
Commenter: Alexander D Grossman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4816 **Comment Id:** 361588 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Remove the poison pill plan with regard to compliance.
Organization:
Commenter: Judith D Kucera **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4829 **Comment Id:** 361611 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jo Evans **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4843 **Comment Id:** 361624 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Douglas Bourgon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4871 **Comment Id:** 361655 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Mary Cronin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4898 **Comment Id:** 361730 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The important thing to monitor is the actual impact of dogs on resources and other users at these specific spaces. No other methodology is valid. Therefore, we oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy of the SEIS.
Organization:
Commenter: sanford goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4918 **Comment Id:** 361773 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Elia Haworth **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4950 **Comment Id:** 361817 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrea Greenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4965 **Comment Id:** 361859 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Denise Jasper **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361919 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Now called the Monitoring-based Management Strategy, the GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions.
Organization:
Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4122 **Comment Id:** 362049 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just

because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Duane Ernst **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4130 **Comment Id:** 362054 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: John Inson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4138 **Comment Id:** 362068 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jonathan M Maguire **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5061 **Comment Id:** 362142 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Brandon Romer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5101 **Comment Id:** 362181 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jim Rise **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4159 **Comment Id:** 362206 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just

because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Jesse Flowers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4181 **Comment Id:** 362214 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5152 **Comment Id:** 362286 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I absolutely oppose the NPS Preferred Alternative outlined in the SEIS, including the massive reduction of off-leash areas, fences enclosing the remaining off-leash areas and implementing the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy. There is no valid justification in the SEIS for these major changes.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5157 **Comment Id:** 362295 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen Austin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4240 **Comment Id:** 362313 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Clifford Liehe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4260 **Comment Id:** 362326 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based

Strategy because the GGNRA can change the rules even if there are no environment impacts.
Organization:
Commenter: Joanne A Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4263 **Comment Id:** 362333 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. This is not a direct or effective way to address a compliance issue.
Organization:
Commenter: Kim Dang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5193 **Comment Id:** 362564 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We oppose the Monitoring Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it believes that not enough people are complying with leash restrictions.
Organization: -
Commenter: sarah nesbitt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362634 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring Based Management Strategy. It is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Even though the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws, and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.
Organization:
Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4966 **Comment Id:** 362802 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions
Organization:
Commenter: Kevin Cronin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5307 **Comment Id:** 362940 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan L Damron **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5320 **Comment Id:** 362967 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5546 **Comment Id:** 363928 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5605 **Comment Id:** 363998 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Kali Kraum **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4378 **Comment Id:** 364135 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

Organization:
Commenter: Alexander E Dozier **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5730 **Comment Id:** 364199 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We love running with our dog off leash in the GGNRA and its one of the reasons we live in the Bay Area. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Kaelee N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5743 **Comment Id:** 364223 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.
Organization:
Commenter: Charna Ball **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5797 **Comment Id:** 364320 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As for the monitoring-based management plan: It's like banning all driving because there are a few bad drivers. Cite the people who cause problems, don't punish the victims.
Organization:
Commenter: Sheila Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5803 **Comment Id:** 364335 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am opposed to the Monitoring Based Management Strategy and in favor of site-specific studies, not general, anecdotally based reports, when it comes to showing the impacts of dogs on the environment.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael B Goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5810 **Comment Id:** 364352 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: implement compliance-based adaptive management that requires at least 95% o dog walkers to comply with the new regulations
Organization:
Commenter: Lew Stringer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5835 **Comment Id:** 364381 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: L Daniels **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5913 **Comment Id:** 364613 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We oppose the monitoring-based strategy in the dog management plan. Just because some people are not complying with leash restrictions does not mean the GGNRA should be able to change policy and ruin it for everyone.
Organization:
Commenter: Greg Fodor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6041 **Comment Id:** 365028 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Making more restrictions will only raise the number of non-compliant pet owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Cristin A McKee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4418 **Comment Id:** 365167 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Eliminate "compliance-based management," which will allow additional restrictions to be implemented without any public input.
Organization:
Commenter: Carol Schlesinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4431 **Comment Id:** 365219 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Another poor idea is the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular areas because it decides

that there is not enough compliance.

Organization:

Commenter: Sharon Searles **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4492 **Comment Id:** 365403 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Eliminate "compliance-based management," which will allow additional restrictions to be implemented without any public input.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan E Dolder **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6120 **Comment Id:** 365475 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Sondra Bishop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365501 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In fact, the proposed policies are substantially less flexible than the present policy. Further, the proposals are being offered without any clear data indicating that the changes will deliver any of the supposed benefits, because of the absence of any of the data required to offer any such analyses - So, how are we to believe that implementation of a policy that is broadly applied elsewhere in the NPS will lead to "information gathering"? If information is not being gathered in any of the other 60 parks operated by the NPS, how will the addition of the GGNRA to this structure suddenly lead to "information gathering"? Therefore, I do not believe that the proposed changes will meet this objective at all - in fact, the proposed changes will reduce flexibility and produce no new data - exactly the OPPOSITE of this objective.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365540 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Monitoring Based Management Strategy Unclear As explained in the Park Operations section: All sites would be regularly monitored. When the level of compliance is deemed unacceptable, based on violations and impacts to resources, primary management actions such as focused enforcement of regulations, education, time and use restrictions, establishment of buffer zones and SUP restrictions would be implemented. If non-compliance

continues, secondary management actions including short-term closures would be implemented through the compendium. The schedule includes a 1-3 month period of public education followed by a 1-3 month period testing the monitoring based strategy. With the above process, the NPS expects that impacts on wildlife and habitats would also decrease. How would those impacts be evaluated and what criteria would be used? What level of non-compliance would be tolerated? Would there be a plan for monitors to visit all sites at regular intervals over what period of time? We understand that monitors not be able to issue warrants but would have to communicate findings to enforcement staff. How would monitors communicate with enforcement personnel efficiently? How would such a communications system successfully identify violators in a timely manner and hold those violators accountable? By the time enforcement personnel appear, wouldn't it be likely the incident would be over?

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6398 **Comment Id:** 366094 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Cynthia DelCorto **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6246 **Comment Id:** 366194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I also oppose the Management-Based Monitoring Strategy (MBMS). It will, de facto, permit GGNRA authorities to unilaterally alter or terminate Regulated Off-Leash Areas (ROLAs). Any proposed changes to ROLAs should be made only after significant enforcement action has been taken and documented, ongoing widespread violations continue, there is a strong case for environmental protection of the area, and all of this is put to public review and input.

Organization:

Commenter: Rhonda Vitanye **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6630 **Comment Id:** 367504 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed ï¿½cecompliance-basedï¿½ approach punishes many for the perceived transgressions of a few. It is a set up for failure and should be modified to create a baseline of current conditions and then measure impacts vs. compliance. The GGNRA should partner with the community to make the plan work, not assume an adversarial relationship with failure the goal.

Organization:

Commenter: Francine Fillice **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6500 **Comment Id:** 367590 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

Organization:

Commenter: Todd Latham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6518 **Comment Id:** 367647 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy because it is no better than the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The emphasis is still on compliance of leash laws. The GGNRA would still be able to change the status of off leash areas for non-compliance, even if there was no proven negative impacts to resources or visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Stafford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 368007 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Monitoring-based Compliance Strategy, which has replaced the "Compliance-based Management Strategy", is still a poison pill, designed to pennit increased curtailment and ultimate ending of off-leash recreation. This is unjust. The emphasis is on leash violations. The SEIS states, "Noncompliance would include dog walking within restricted areas, dog walking under voice and sight control in designated on-leash dog walking areas, and dog walking under voice and sight control outside of established ROLAs." (20) Yet the GGNRA, in seeking to drastically curtail opportunities, trails, and areas to walk off-leash, and seeking to force the hundreds of thousands of dogs and their people to walk in ever-decreasing spaces, is setting up the definitive scenario in which almost everyone who does not have their dog on-leash almost everywhere in the few places in the GGNRA where dogs are permitted at all, would be more likely than not to do something unlawful, because the off-leash areas are so few and far between. The GGNRA already has policies and penalties for those who break the laws. Using these penalties to reduce off-leash or any canine access still further is vindictive.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 368009 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Monitoring-based Compliance Strategy, which has replaced the "Compliance-based Management Strategy", is still a poison pill, designed to pennit increased curtailment and ultimate ending of off-leash recreation. This is unjust. The emphasis is on leash violations. The SEIS states, "Noncompliance would include dog walking within restricted areas, dog walking under voice and sight control in designated on-leash dog walking areas, and dog

walking under voice and sight control outside of established ROLAs." (20) Yet the GGNRA, in seeking to drastically curtail opportunities, trails, and areas to walk off-leash, and seeking to force the hundreds of thousands of dogs and their people to walk in ever-decreasing spaces, is setting up the definitive scenario in which almost everyone who does not have their dog on-leash almost everywhere in the few places in the GGNRA where dogs are permitted at all, would be more likely than not to do something unlawful, because the off-leash areas are so few and far between. The GGNRA already has policies and penalties for those who break the laws. Using these penalties to reduce off-leash or any canine access still further is vindictive.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368104 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on 100% compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if it deems park users are in non-compliance. It reserves the right to restrict further dog walking if there are unspecified violations or impacts in the future. The plan makes inconsistent assumptions and is arbitrary.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6641 **Comment Id:** 368132 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Individuals who break the rules should be penalized, but the majority who do observe the rules and keep their dogs under control should be punished for the misdeeds of others.

Organization:

Commenter: Randall E Ham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368268 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Monitoring Based Management Strategy contains no identifiable standards upon which the NPS is to proceed in its power to close off any or all dog walking areas within the GGNRA as it will be implemented when "the level of compliance is deemed unacceptable based on violations". This provides the NPS with unchecked authority to close any and all parts fo the GGNRAto dogs without any public hearing or notice, and does not prevent arbitrary and capricious closures by the NPS.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 550 **Comment Id:** 368321 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The Monitoring Based Management Strategy is again a poison pill. This proposed compliance strategy has a measure of compliance that is totally subjective, with the GGNRA making all the decisions. Further, short or long term (permanent) closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA. It appears the language is designed to allow the GGNRA to make most or all of Fort Funston a native plant restoration/habitat, despite the fact that this is inconsistent with the enabling legislation and MOU with SF.

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 768 **Comment Id:** 368353 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristin Lamoureux **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368436 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is unsettling that NPS has not performed a full risk-assessment and resource analysis of the impact of off-leash dog activity in GGNRA in the SEIS. It is difficult for me to find NPS credible in the claim that they will monitor compliance and provide a realistic and effective solution to any problems encountered, given the lack of transparency in the SEIS concerning what criteria the NPS will use to evaluate acceptable levels of compliance.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6495 **Comment Id:** 368677 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As with most of the SEIS, the monitoring based system is deeply flawed. Is still employs a punitive system of compliance that does not engage the dog walking community and users. Systems that only punish and do not actively partner with the dog community/users can only have the purpose = a designed failure with the purpose of removing dogs from the GGNRA.

Organization:
Commenter: Scott Stawicki **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1071 **Comment Id:** 368731 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS is not valid because the MONITORING BASED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY contains a Poison Pill that nobody wants! I also oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy because it unfairly carries a "poison pill". The MBMS is still based on compliance. It still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.
Organization:
Commenter: Janet Slissman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1137 **Comment Id:** 368736 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth B Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1138 **Comment Id:** 368742 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Mario Yovkov **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1139 **Comment Id:** 368748 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Alan Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6584 **Comment Id:** 369579 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6678 **Comment Id:** 369621 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SETS incorporates a monitoring-based management strategy that allows Park Service staff to monitor noncompliance and impacts to natural resources, rather than the initial automatic triggers that were originally proposed. This strategy allows management actions to be implemented when the level of compliance is deemed unacceptable based on violations and/or impacts to resources. However, this leaves the door open for limited enforcement by the Park Service. There must be some kind of demonstrable commitment of enforcement from the Park Service, rather than simply a wait-and-see approach. If the Park Service must use adaptive management, it still needs accountability mechanisms in place that guarantee effective management of the GGNRA. One change that should be made is a lower percentage of compliance triggering further review for an area. The Park Service previously admitted that it was only striving for 75% compliance, and now it does not even have a specific threshold at all, only what will be deemed unacceptable. Even if there are no measures that apply automatically, there should still be a clearly defined compliance rate in place that triggers further review. The SETS states a 75 percent threshold could trigger restrictions in some areas by only one hundred violations, while other sites might require several thousand violations before a change was implemented, despite greater impacts to resources and values in the latter case. (SEIS pg. 64). The same amount of review that would be required to determine what is unacceptable for a site could be done during the current planning phase. This would promote transparency and allow for public review of the Park Services plan to address non-compliance in each area. The environmental review process is intended to be comprehensive and failing to set specific goals thresholds does nothing but further delay the inevitable.

Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Commenter: Laura Horton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6590 **Comment Id:** 369663 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The NPS in the SEIS modifies and renames the adaptive management program as a Monitoring-Based Management Strategy Despite these sensible goals, unfortunately, the SEIS does not provide clarity on exactly what and how the system will actually work. See SEIS p. 63-67. The entirety of the discussion of the Monitoring Based Management Strategy appears to take less than 7 pages of the SEIS. While understandably one size does not fit all, the monitoring-based management strategy is in essence a program that says the NPS will know

when the program is not working when they see it and will do whatever they think makes sense without any public input so long as closures are for one year or less. The SEIS fails to adequately analyze and take into account the recommendations contained in CFDG Appendix A to May 27, 2011 comments which is again incorporated as part of these comments as Ex. A. While the NPS says that the program will be peer reviewed and available for public comment, there is no description of how, when or under what circumstances those conditions will be met. See SEIS p. 66. The general description of If compliance rates or resource impacts are deemed unacceptable based on the previous 12 months monitoring data in one of the zones, in spite of the parks primary management actions, the park will evaluate secondary management responses, including short-term closures does not explain what is meant by deemed unacceptable by whom or by what standard. SEIS p. 66. Moreover, there is no description of how park users will be kept informed of the monitoring results at meaningful times to provide additional information to the NPS. Finally, the ultimate threat is that if the NPS decides that the administrative burden is too much, then the benefits in allowing the use is outweighed by the NPS administrative burden required to manage the use, draining limited resources needed for other important park programs without any standards how that determination will be made.

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Commenter: Martha Walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/28/2014)

CR2010 Cultural Resources: Affected Environment (Substantive)

1. Commenters expressed doubt that dogs were impacting cultural resources at the GGNRA, and noted that humans were much more likely to impact these resources.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 3994 **Comment Id:** 360395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs destroying historical sights? Like the austere concrete bunkers designed to withstand an enemy attack? Dogs causing erosion? Surely, natural processes share most of the blame for the sand hillsides falling into the ocean.

Organization:

Commenter: Bjorn Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369484 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The idea that cultural resources such as buried missile silos at Fort Funston require protection from dogs trampling, digging or urinating is far-fetched at best. I would point out that the larger size and weight of humans would be a greater threat to trample notable sites than would dogs. With respect to missile silos at Fort Funston I would not assume all urine deposited would be that of the canine visitors. The GGNRA still has not installed any permanent bathrooms for the many human visitors at Fort Funston. In fact, it seems the GGNRA has little regard for the enjoyment of these resources.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/28/2014)

EJ2010 Environmental Justice: Affected Environment (Substantive)

1. **Commenters noted that there are a wide range of ages, ethnicities, and economic classes that visit the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and commercial dog walkers comprise a diverse group of people. These commenters feel that the misrepresented some groups' feelings towards dogs by stating they avoid dogs or are afraid of them. Conversely, one commenter stated that elderly people currently avoid Golden Gate National Recreation Area because of the presence of the dogs.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5224 **Comment Id:** 362695 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off-leash recreation is currently enjoyed by a diversity of people, e.g. young & old, rich and poor, able-bodied and differently-abled. Additionally, unlike many other GGNRA/NPS activities, dog walkers include many people of color. Spend weekend at Fort Funston and you'll see a wide variety of folks. One might contrast this to the demographic of some other outdoor recreational activities. (Do not count student "volunteers" who are in weeding the park for community service credits.) Although some opponents of off-leash dog walking will say "*seniors & children & various ethnicities, etc. are afraid/avoid dogs," note there are hundreds of seniors & children and people of color who LIKE off-leash dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: K Hu **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6204 **Comment Id:** 366007 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many older people now avoid parks and the GGNRA because of all of the dogs, mostly off leash. Even on-leash dogs can jump on a person, especially when they are walked on the long expandable leashes. I think that you need to specify a maximum leash length of 6 feet. I get tired of having leashes wrap around my legs and that entrapment is also dangerous.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters feel that the use of the survey data is contradictory and doesn't support the management plan. Several commenters are offended by stereotypical statements in the document and feel that an environmental justice analysis is unwarranted as it lumps people into unnecessary categories.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5227 **Comment Id:** 362709 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The NPS cites Environmental Justice as a reason for implementing the Plan,

but the survey data presented by the NPS indicates that this rationale is not based in fact. Within the flawed 2002 phone survey, African-Americans, Asians, Caucasians, and Hispanics all show the same general support for off-leash walking (37-44%, African-Americans showing the most support). A separate NPS visitor survey cited later in the report shows no measurable difference in the opinion between Caucasians and Asians on dogs, and no issues citied by Black/African Americans:

Organization:

Commenter: David Nielsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369482 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The issue of Environmental Justice, as it is postulated in the DEIS/SEIS is offensive at best. To claim that ethnic minorities are dissuaded from visiting the park because dogs are present is a perversion of the data. None of the 20 or more recommendations in the study about what the GGNRA could do to increase accessibility by minorities includes banning or restricting dogs. The study was flawed in that it was a small sample of non-randomly selected people who were largely unfamiliar with the GGNRA (only 1/3 had visited at least one GGNRA site in the past year). This creates a situation where opinions about the GGNRA are obtained from people who have not experienced the GGNRA to any significant degree. It is more likely that the measurements only reflect their perception of the GGNRA, not what actually occurs there. The responses obtained from this study might be well suited to establishing a public relations campaign for the GGNRA, but not establishing park policy. If the GGNRA had complied with their legal requirement to have this "study" peer reviewed, maybe it would have been modified so as to actually produce results that could have been informative.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4365 **Comment Id:** 368823 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have carefully read the document provided in support of the proposed policy changes for dog walking in the GGNRA. I was astonished to find a section of the report on "Environmental Justice", and read this section carefully to try and understand the argument being made. This section presents data suggesting that minorities are especially concerned about the problems associated with off-leash dog walking : "...Research found that these minority groups mentioned dogs, especially dog waste, as a barrier to park visitation, and overall, Latinos were the most concerned with dog owners' lack of concern or control of their dogs (Roberts 2007, iii)." However, even throughout this section, the data presented frequently contradicts the conclusion offered by the report. For example, "...in the telephone survey conducted by Arizona University's Social Research Laboratory, 39.4 percent of respondents of Hispanic origin supported (strongly and somewhat) off-leash dog walking and 39.9 percent of respondents of non-Hispanic origin supported (strongly and somewhat) off-leash dog walking (NAU 2002b, 93)." Here, there is no detectable difference between the opinions of different groups. Basically, this "evidence" does not support any particular conclusion or policy. Why is this presented? A careful reading of this entire section of the report does not produce any evidence to support the

GGNRA presumption that the current policies are "unjust". Even worse, I find this entire section offensive because of the way it presents stereotypes and racially-biased comments throughout the analysis. Furthermore, I am upset that the NPS would go to this trouble in attempting to manufacture a racial justice argument to support their objective. Is the goal of the NPS to divide and conquer? Is it so important to restrict off-leash dog walking that the NPS would try to divide us along racial lines in order to do so? Even more so, I was greatly surprised to see that the authors of this report are so intensely focused on presenting evidence to support their chosen conclusion that they would include such an offensive section in the report - ESPECIALLY because the information presented in this section does not even give any direct support for the proposed policy change. The only thing that could possibly be accomplished here is to generate a division along racial lines which could be exploited to justify a policy change. I just find this whole tactic offensive.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 5799 **Comment Id:** 364326 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I realize that there are a number of people from other cultures newly arrived to the US who are afraid of dogs, as their only experience of dogs has been slum dogs, dangerous, untrained, wild creatures. We don't have many of those in the US, but I have seen a number of immigrants who react with fear to the laziest yawn from a Golden Retriever. While wishing to respect people's cultural beliefs and backgrounds, and while I don't believe that everyone needs to have dogs in their lives, none the less I don't believe that the rights of people who are dog-lovers should be restricted.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila A Brady **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6116 **Comment Id:** 365467 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Diversity - Dog walkers constitute the most diverse group of people who use the GGNRA - people of all ages, people with disabilities, gay and straight, all ethnic groups, all religions, all social and economic classes - all interacting in positive ways, bound by their common love of dogs. There is no mention of this diversity in the DEIS. Minorities are mentioned only in the context of being afraid of dogs. The DEIS incorrectly quotes from a focus group of people who had largely never been to the GGNRA as proof that minorities dont come to the GGNRA because of the dogs. " to quote SFDog.

Organization:

Commenter: SUSAN OBAYASHI **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366082 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGAS notes that the observations of the Toohey and McCormack surveys-the two most comprehensive and updated surveys of their kind-agree with findings in the SEIS and its supporting documentation, including The General Technical Report submitted to the GGNRA and the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy in 2007, which found: Dogs as problems were mentioned by all Latino and Asian groups. For example, dogs off leash create fear. Dog owners not picking up feces in fields, on trails and beaches, and picnic areas reduce enjoyment of the experience. Latinos, overall, expressed concern about dog owners "not caring" or lacking control (e.g., owners assume other people will like their dog as much as they do; allowing dogs to approach other people without their permission; dogs begging for food and owners not retracting them).

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369483 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What the study overlooks is that dog walking connects all different kinds of people to the parks. Had the subjects in this survey been to Fort Funston or Crissy Field recently they would have seen a wide diversity of people - - seniors, kids, disabled people, Asian-Americans, African-Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, all there with dogs. Compare that mix to any other GGNRA park activity (with nowhere near the diversity) and the "we have to restrict dogs to protect ethnic minorities" argument appears misguided and somewhat condescending.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6669 **Comment Id:** 369542 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GGNRA, must immediately provide ADA access at Fort Funston. How is it that a Federal Organization cannot comply with federal law. I am a lifelong resident, native, disabled, dog owner. I believe that I am legally entitlad to recreate with my dogs off leash at the SF Beaches as I always have for 50 yrs.

Organization:

Commenter: Bess Martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/28/2014)

EJ4000 Environmental Justice: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives (Substantive)

1. **Commenters expressed concern over those people who do not have cars or other means of access to parks outside of the city. Commenters stated that many residents of the city of San Francisco fall into this category, especially the elderly and people with low-income. Many commenters expressed the need for ROLAs for the elderly and disabled.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 3840 **Comment Id:** 359963 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This new regulation is going to substantially change the nature of Marin County and the area that so many animal owners cherish and have for so many years. It is too sweeping a change; unfair to so many people who count on those trails and beaches for their own health and exercise and that of their pets. This new regulation would put many people on the road to the few places left, leaving them overcrowded. It would prevent countless older people from going out for a walk with their pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia L Ryan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361120 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS also sites that the only off-leash area for all of Marins 60,000 dogs would be a small stretch of Rodeo Beach. That beach is only accessible via car. Right now, many people can walk to their favorite off-leash trail including Oakwood, Miwok, Homestead and others. These federal lands are intertwined with our neighborhoods. Forcing people into their cars to exercise themselves and their dogs is not only horrible for the environment but also hard on the pocketbook. I also think its quite fiendish since the GGNRA has been in the process of downsizing the parking lot at Rodeo Beach and will begin encouraging people to take shuttles therefore making it increasingly impossible for Rodeo to become a full fledge ROLA in the future

Organization:

Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368267 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed ROLO areas described in the SEIS are prejudicial to senior citizens and the disabled. It is very dangerous to attempt to navigate the paths to the beach with a dog on a leash in the event the owner falls/slips. The proposed ROLO areas will deny disabled people the ability to have their dogs off leash as much of the proposed ROLO areas will not be

accessible as the dogs will not be within visual range of persons who must stay on the paved paths due to disability.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Several commenters view the management plan as a socioeconomic issue that will lower property value, reduce economy from park visitors, and affect commercial dog walking business.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 2170 **Comment Id:** 356094 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In closing, I want to emphasize that the GGNRA land within Pacifica is adjacent to areas of high population density. Since the incorporation of the City in 1957, the citizens of Pacifica have fought hard to defend keeping their hillsides as open space. It is because of the vigilance of Pacifica's citizens that these tracts of land exist at all to become part of the GGNRA. Historically, Sweeney Ridge was used for cattle grazing and was later proposed for residential housing. Mori Point and Pedro Headlands were badly torn up and eroded because of use by motorcyclists. Over the years, Pacificans have worked hard to help restore native vegetation in these heavily impacted areas. Pacifica does not have a strong commercial tax base. It has been proposed that "Our Ecology is our Economy". If Pacifica is known to tourists as a "dog friendly" town, we will be able to attract many more visitors to enjoy our trails and open space, adding to our economic prosperity. The economic consequences of severely limiting dog access to GGNRA trails are potentially profound to our fiscally fragile community.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4562 **Comment Id:** 360654 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The impact of your plan on my industry will be huge. Many people will no longer have work. Businesses will fold, debts will go unpaid. people who contribute to society now will find themselves unable to do so anymore.

Organization:

Commenter: steve r hooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **While one commenter stated that walking with a dog makes some people feel safe, other commenters suggested that dogs at Golden Gate National Recreation Area act as a barrier to recreation for some groups of people due to the uncontrolled behavior of some dogs, as well as dog waste.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 2930 **Comment Id:** 355231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed policies have an adverse impact on the disabled and elderly, and

on people that might not feel com fortable visiting our beautiful parks without their dogs in tow: for example women trying to exercise by themselves or simply going for a walk alone.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: karin mac donald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6678 **Comment Id:** 369613 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off-leash dogs and dog waste also create barriers for ethnic minorities who want to use the park. There are already disproportionate rates of general park use between white and ethnic minority users, as GGNRA visitors are still much more likely to be white than city or state residents. 7In addition, recreational opportunities for those with lower incomes have become increasingly more difficult as income inequality rises and income gaps between White citizens and Black and Latino citizens have also continued to increase(8). These economic constraints create even further barriers for ethnic minorities to use public parkland. Although some have argued, as noted in the SEIS, that park use by ethnic minority populations would increase with more available off-leash areas, several reports and studies show the opposite is true. (SEIS pg. 330). A 2007 study conducted by Nina Roberts of San Francisco State University found that Asian and Latino park users consider uncontrolled dogs and dog waste to be a barrier to visiting the Park(9). The Park Service acknowledged those findings in the SEIS; however, the Park Service also cited to a 2002 Northern Arizona University study(10) in an apparent effort to discount or downplay those findings(11). But a review of the 2002 studys relevant data in fact confirms the concerns regarding off-leash dogs discussed in this letter, and the Final EIS must reflect this.

Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Commenter: Laura Horton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 446 **Comment Id:** 351383 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This diretly influenes my Property value. I will gather a local class action law suit. against The GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Tom Jagger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 567 **Comment Id:** 352649 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I suspect that this change in policy may be racially motivated. In my experience, Chinese people do not like dogs and are often afraid of dogs. With such a large Chinese population now in SF (and a mayor of Chinese decent) .. I suspect that this change in dog policy is racially motivated and supported by dog haters. This is at least something to consider.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2763 **Comment Id:** 353276 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: With additional restrictions and bans, people will have to be in the cars looking for other places to walk their dogs. Do you want to add to the traffic and pollution for the environment?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1915 **Comment Id:** 354540 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And there are also many dog owners, especially the elderly and physically challenged people in the city, who don't have cars or easy access to go to parks outside of the city.

Organization:

Commenter: Dog Owner N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3002 **Comment Id:** 354731 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because Crissy Field is the only place accessible by public transportation where the many apartment dogs of Lower Nob Hill can get maximum exercise. My dog provides emotional support for me every day, and our one-a-month trips to Crissy Field are my support for him.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Rich Bartlebaugh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2883 **Comment Id:** 354904 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it restricts the ability of any San Francisco resident, who vast majority do not have access to a backyard facility in their own homes, to safely and healthily own a dog.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Alita Macias **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2943 **Comment Id:** 355248 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because dogs are an essential part of humanife and have been for thousands of years. To prevent access to NRA's is discrimination.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Rowan paul **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2956 **Comment Id:** 355265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will restrict access to an important recreational opportunity for both dogs and their owners. Off-leash dog walking is an important opportunity for many to get exercise and socialize with others in the com munity, including with people of other races, ethnicities, socioeconomic statuses, physical abilities, etc.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Robert Durham **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3885 **Comment Id:** 355627 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because people and pets need open space to be active with their dogs.Not everyone in a city has the luxury of having a yard for pets to be active. Having a beautiful space to com e play with your dog gets people off their couches and enjoying parks.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: kelly haeussler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Additionally, there is no study of the real environmental impact of these restrictions on the rest of San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo Counties. The NPS has not considered how these restrictions will affect local communities and City parks. Given the already miniscule percentage (less than 1%) GGNRA currently available to visitors with dogs, the NPS plan is grossly unjust. It would severely impact the lives of its current users and adversely impact the lives of tens of thousands of Bay Area residents.

Organization: Dog City Tours

Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3200 **Comment Id:** 357966 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Since dogs will no longer be allowed in the vast majority of Ocean Beach, specifically near where I live, I will be forced to drive my dog to another recreation areas instead of walking to the beach as I now do. Many other people who live along ocean beach and who have dogs will also be forced to drive instead of walking. This will increase traffic and congestion around other neighborhoods and parks and badly impacts older or lower income people who do not own vehicles.

Organization:

Commenter: Alan Berezin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3958 **Comment Id:** 360188 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA lands are beautiful and picturesque, but it is becoming exceedingly difficult to use and enjoy the space due to this plan, along with little public transportation, limited (pay only)and construction

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Tausend **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4641 **Comment Id:** 361159 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The only off leash location in Marin will be Rodeo Beach. Unfortunately Rpdeo Beach is only accessible by auto therefore all the dogs and their owners who do hot have cars are unable to go to Rodeo Beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Wendy Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4682 **Comment Id:** 361320 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a disabled person. I feel it's discrimination to make these changes that you propose. I won't be able to walk in places like Fort Funston if I can't use the paths. Please allow us to continue use of these areas, I as a dog owner have the legal right to these areas, just like

everyone else.
Organization:
Commenter: Barbara A Boschetti **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4695 **Comment Id:** 361349 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The beaches and Fort Funston is where we experience freedom. As people living in an urban environment we need to be able to let our dogs experience nature. Banning us from walking our dogs is not only an injustice it is an infringement on our civil rights.
Organization:
Commenter: Giorgio Anthony **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4851 **Comment Id:** 361632 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The needs of people with handicaps has not been addressed. Some of us can't walk dogs on leashes.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeri and John E Flinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4903 **Comment Id:** 361749 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As an older person with mobility problems due to a disability, I find that the East Beach of Crissy Field is the only place I can comfortably take my dog to the beach. Parking is close enough to the water and there is an access ramp that makes it possible to get to the water with ease. To take away that particular area from off leash possibility would, in my view, discriminate against the older and disabled people that take their dogs there for exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: Sheila A Koren **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361985 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, we are home to several elderly residents, most of whom own dogs and walk them on the Beach. The requirement to have a dog on-leash may diminish their ability to adequately exercise their pets and themselves. This is unjust.
Organization:
Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5307 **Comment Id:** 362941 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please seriously consider the above comments and help those of us who are

older or physically limited. We cherish our dogs and their companionship and want them to be able to benefit from off-leash areas in the GGNRA where they can get the exercise and play time they so deserve.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan L Damron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5349 **Comment Id:** 363007 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Elderly people, special needs people and lower income people are more severely and unfairly punished by these current GGNRA proposals because they will have to travel so far to properly take care of their dogs. They may not be able to do so and may be forced to surrender their beloved companions.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Bouchard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5475 **Comment Id:** 363339 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am physically handicapped and cannot run with my dog. I walked slowly. I therefore need the ability to play fetch with my dog in order to exercise her so she is low stress. Therefore I feel this plan is biased.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A Helman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5652 **Comment Id:** 364076 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have on GGNRA properties for the past six years. My husband is a senior citizen and enjoys taking his regular walks with our dog at Ft. Funston. It is a great place to get exercise and to socialize with dog owners and other visitors.

Organization: a proud dog owner and voter

Commenter: Laura M Birsinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5830 **Comment Id:** 364375 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm disabled with a mobility service dog and this is the only way to exercise my dog while she's not working. Please expand the off leash areas, not limit them

Organization:

Commenter: Rowan R Chandler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5995 **Comment Id:** 364870 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We need our off leash areas left in place. There are many dog owners in the city that use them daily. Many of the dog owners are elderly and/or disabled and it is difficult for them to get to parks that aren't part of the National Park Service.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6062 **Comment Id:** 365282 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The preferred alternative would unfairly discriminate against disabled and senior recreational access by unreasonably enforcing a six foot limit on leash length. For seniors and disabled persons there needs to be greater flexibility in the tether, such as either voice control or the popular retractable leashes. Having recently suffered a neck injury I have found that even with my well-trained dog I can not comfortably walk with a fixed length shorter leash without experiencing occasional painful and damaging pulls on the leash. Consequently I think that the Park Service should accommodate disabled and senior access by allowing use of retractable leashes greater than six feet in length in some portions of the Recreation Area.

Organization:

Commenter: John Keating **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6138 **Comment Id:** 365595 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Thank you for restricting dogs in Chrissy field. I am an elderly lady who enjoys walking on the beach, but I am afraid of being knocked down by the large dogs running around on the beach. They are unpredictable and often out of control. Their owners are not able to control them. Thank you for preserving the beaches for people!

Organization:

Commenter: Allison N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6704 **Comment Id:** 365778 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Accommodate disabled and senior access by allowing use in some areas of retractable leashes greater than six feet in length.

Organization:

Commenter: John Keating **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366025 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute (CFLR) published a summary of the Toohey (2011) and McCormack (2010) studies and summarized impacts to non-dog owners due to dog activity in urban parks to include: â€¢ Dogs are often perceived as a nuisance, due to dog waste, litter and disturbance; â€¢ Uncontrolled dogs create perceptions of

risks to public safety; and â€¢ Older adults, women, and ethnic minorities are more likely to perceive dogs as barriers to physical activity than other groups. o Women who perceived off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods had 50 minutes less of physical activity than women in neighborhoods who did not observe off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods; and o Latino women perceived off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods or parks as barriers to letting their children play outside. These perceptions creat barriers to outdoor physical activity for many. The SEIS fails to adequately emphasize the disenfranchisement or loss of activity to many in the community due to the status quo of dog-related recreation in the GGNRA.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6612 **Comment Id:** 367190 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe older owners who currently enjoy taking their dogs to these areas will have a more difficult time if the areas are restricted. The sense of community is important to those people as well.

Organization:

Commenter: Alice Sakamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6459 **Comment Id:** 368543 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sutro Heights Park - We continue to prefer seeing a greater accommodation to those visitors who would prefer a no dog experience, which here could include a number of people with physical challenges that would find it more difficult to visit other units of the GGNRA.

Organization: San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Commenter: Steven Krefting **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4287 **Comment Id:** 368815 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The DEIS does not seem to consider demographics: Answer a question - is dog ownership in San Mateo/San Francisco County/Marin increasing or decreasing? All the studies I have seen it is increasing. Therefore, as caretakers for lands given your trust for recreational purposes by those counties should you not take that in consideration and offer an alternative where you INCREASE off leash areas? Off leash areas, at the time of the 1979 Pet Policy was limited to only 1% o all the lands you administer. Since then new land has been added but you have DECREASED the percentage of those lands to below 1%. is there no alternative where you reflect demographics and the desires of the citizens of those counties who gave you the land and offer another alternative where you increase these lands? Alternatively, since you only have 1% o lands open to dogs, why not, if you take certain areas away can you not have an alternative where you give back other lands now currently closed? I would have loved to have seen somewhere in the DEIS something along the lines of We are proposing removing XXXX from

off-leash areas, but are opening up YYYY to off-leash use.You have the space. Why not use it?

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Norton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369456 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Sunset Trail is still closed to the public (including those with disabilities), and the Preferred Alternative would restrict more of the trails the disabled might possibly access at Fort Funston to recreate with their dogs. At Sweeney Ridge in Pacifica stands the Portola Monument, considered to be the most historic site in the GGNRA. When the GGNRA took control of this property, it closed the access road off to cars, thereby preventing the disabled or mobility impaired from accessing this site. The hike from the current parking spot is 2.5 miles to the Monument, with an elevation rise of some 1,000 feet. The GGNRA has made no legitimate effort to remedy this situation, despite complaints from the City Council in Pacifica, and groups representing senior citizens. This DEIS/SEIS further restricts access to this portion of the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6663 **Comment Id:** 369527 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If that area is lost, those owners wll bring their large dogs to the smaller city parks where there is more danger of overcrowding. Not only dog owners and their dogs will suffer, but small chiIdren or elderly or handicapped people may be crowded out.

Organization:

Commenter: Norma Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6678 **Comment Id:** 369614 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The Park Service stated that the 2002 study found that Hispanic and non-Hispanic populations supported off-leash dog walking by almost the same percentages; however, the fact remains that the Hispanic community is already underrepresented in the Park(12). Thus, it is inappropriate for the Park Service to compare the response rates of the two groups in light of the later 2007 findings, and importantly, in light of the fact that the 2002 survey was conducted only in English with no available Spanish translation(13). Moreover, the 2002 findings show overwhelmingly that ethnic minorities oppose off-leash dog walking in the Park, particularly in light of the Park Services mission, and support regulations that prohibit off-leash dog walking(14). Three relevant questions that were asked in the 2002 survey include questions 11, 13, and 17. Question 11 asked [c]urrent regulations allow for walking dogs on-leash at most GGNRA sites and prohibit any off- leash dog walking. Do you support or oppose this current regulation? 70.5% of respondents of Hispanic origin, 69.3% of Asian Americans, and 718% of African Americans responded that they either strongly or somewhat supported current

regulations(15). Question 13 asked [d]o you support or oppose allowing off-leash dog walking in GGNRA sites? 52% of respondents of Hispanic origin, 49.2% of Asian Americans, and 49.6% of African Americans responded that they either strongly or somewhat opposed allowing off-leash dog walking(16). Question 17 asked the same as question 13, but explained the mission of the GGNRA beforehand. Knowing the GGNRAs mission, 56.6% of respondents of Hispanic origin, 59.7% of Asian Americans, and 67.5% of African Americans responded that they either strongly or somewhat opposed allowing off-leash dog walking in the Park(17).

Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Commenter: Laura Horton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/28/2014)

GA1000 Impact Analysis: General Comment (Substantive)

1. **Commenters stated that the justifications for the actions outlined in the DMP seemed vague and speculative, or unscientific. Many commenters noted that impacts stated in the SEIS were overstated, and the environmental degradation from dogs was insignificant, and worried that the plan would increase environmental impacts.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1031 **Comment Id:** 351456 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It seems you have attempted to show justification for your actions, but it does not appear that any of the justifications you have put forth, or cited in your papers, environmental or otherwise, have merit or factual significance to them. Your statements appear vague and speculative.

Organization:

Commenter: deborah l riat **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2184 **Comment Id:** 356677 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Reading through various reports, I see very little included in the impact reports from those who support dog walking in these areas and yet a great deal from those opposed. Many of the impacts sited were 'mights' or 'cans' or 'coulds' - I find this lack of evidence along with the lack of site-specific studies to be disturbing.

Organization:

Commenter: Beth Feingold **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2529 **Comment Id:** 359028 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As for other GGNRA locations, the NPS needs to provide substantial scientific evidence and measurements, instead of just speculation and exaggeration, before discouraging people from continuing our heritage of walking dogs in these areas. These same DEIS criteria for adverse impact levels would easily exclude all humans from the park without any evidence of real degradations to the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Heather t Prahl **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4244 **Comment Id:** 362317 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Contrary to Congressional intention, the current GGNRA plan restricts off

leash dog walking without factual basis, relying instead on outdated data and undocumented assumptions. It does not demonstrate that problems within the GGNRA are actually attributable to dogs and not to other factors such as crowds for special events, wildlife, and even nature herself. And these restrictions will negatively impact the few remaining areas allowing off leash walking.

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Commenter: Peter F Jardine **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6056 **Comment Id:** 365272 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe protecting our environment should be a high priority for our community, however, I encourage you to ensure that the policies implemented in the plan for the GGNRA don't overly rely on perceptions or assumptions about impacts of dogs on the GGNRA. Any decisions that would have a significant impact on the availability of this immense resource should be based on sound scientific evidence and process.

Organization:

Commenter: Sienna Rogers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6518 **Comment Id:** 367646 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS has few scientific peer reviewed studies to show that dogs have a significant impact. They rely on the "best professional judgement of NPS staff." Anecdotal observations are not a scientific way to compile evidence. NPS staff have demonstrated a bias against dog walking, so their opinions cannot be trusted

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Stafford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369193 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS assumes, but fails to demonstrate, the "cause and effect" relationship that where dogs are present within GGNRA sites, there is a disturbance of natural resources or demonstrate that the disturbance of resources is attributable to dogs (versus other factors).

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters felt that a greater study of the impacts of the alternatives on resources was warranted, including impacts on natural resources, visitor experience, and health and safety. Commenters also noted that additional resources should be analyzed in the SEIS, including the health benefits of dogs, surrounding**

communities, disabled users, etc.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 3030 **Comment Id:** 357728 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This Environmental Impact Statement is fatally flawed because it utterly fails to address the single most serious environmental issue of our generation: Carbon Dioxide releases This plan is an environmental disaster. How the NPS could have proposed this is crazy. At a time when we all are doing everything we can to curb CO2 emissions the NPS is requiring families to release millions of extra pounds a year. Yet the NPS chooses to totally ignore this in the Report.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3824 **Comment Id:** 359917 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please provide a revenue statement showing how much money in leash and litter violations you have historically collected versus the cost of your administration and employees so that I might respectfully consider a change of opinion.

Organization:

Commenter: Geoff Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361122 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In Marin, the GGNRA Dog Management Plan is simply devastating to our culture and lifestyle. We rely on our trails and beaches to maintain a connection to nature. And we do this in tandem with our dogs. NEPA law required agencies to consider impacts on surrounding communities. This has not been done and I find that not only illegal but unconscionable.

Organization:

Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4816 **Comment Id:** 361585 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: NEPA requires evaluation of impacts on the human environment, but the DEIS fails to do so by failing to adequately address how the proposal affects recreational values for these local residents, or to evaluate the impact on local parks of such a drastic change in existing policies

Organization:

Commenter: Judith D Kucera **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4851 **Comment Id:** 361632 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The needs of people with handicaps has not been addressed. Some of us can't walk dogs on leashes.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeri and John E Flinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364794 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Plan is missing giving appropriate weight to the benefits of dog walking on humans. Those benefits are stated in the report, but nowhere is there a calculation of the benefit thereof in weighing the four alternatives.

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365555 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Need for Environmental Review for New Trails It appears that trails that are not presently in existence are being considered part of the Management Plan and evaluated in this DSEIS, such as new trails at Homestead Valley. It also appears that the trail locations may have not even been determined at this time. This DSEIS should provide sufficient information about these and any other trails that are not currently in place. This is necessary to enable evaluation of the potential adverse impacts on adjacent habitats and wildlife of human and dog use and to evaluate whether there is a less environmentally damaging alternative location. If this information is not provided in this DSEIS, a separate environmental review for these non-existent trails should be conducted.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366025 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute (CFLR) published a summary of the Toohey (2011) and McCormack (2010) studies and summarized impacts to non-dog owners due to dog activity in urban parks to include: â€¢ Dogs are often perceived as a nuisance, due to dog waste, litter and disturbance; â€¢ Uncontrolled dogs create perceptions of risks to public safety; and â€¢ Older adults, women, and ethnic minorities are more likely to perceive dogs as barriers to physical activity than other groups. o Women who perceived off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods had 50 minutes less of physical activity than women in neighborhoods who did not observe off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods; and o Latino women perceived off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods or parks as barriers to letting their children play outside. These perceptions creat barriers to outdoor physical activity for many. The SEIS fails to adequately emphasize the disenfranchisement or loss of activity to many in the community due to the status quo of dog-related recreation in the GGNRA.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6596 **Comment Id:** 369626 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: This DEIS and Plan doesn't recognize that environmental values include both recreation and nature. In many places, the DEIS treats the environment and recreation as opposing values, i.e., that recreation only harms natural resources. The document doesn't acknowledge that people care about both and that people with dogs are often also good stewards of our environment.
Organization:
Commenter: Timothy Sinclair **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. Commenters noted that site specific and peer-reviewed studies were lacking in the SEIS and needed to be completed. Other commenters stated that the information presented in the impacts analysis was outdated.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 667 **Comment Id:** 352866 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: How can the GGNRA undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies (as required by federal law) as a means to identify the alleged impairment?! Anecdotal comments and the "potential" to damage the area just don't cut it.
Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2087 **Comment Id:** 355678 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Health and social benefits aside, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah Stromska **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357572 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not do them.
Organization:

Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2378 **Comment Id:** 358450 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375) so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.
Organization:
Commenter: Aparna L Reddy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5546 **Comment Id:** 363930 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366216 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: A major flaw shared by both the 2011 DEIS and the 2013 SEIS is they provide no site-specific studies or evidence to support their strongly stated conclusions that allowing dogs access to limited areas in the GGNRA results in a negative impact on those areas. This process has been going on for more than eight years, giving the GGNRA ample time to gather data demonstrating a severe negative impact from off-leash dog walking, but they have chosen not to do so.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

4. Many commenters expressed that the impacts analysis did not adequately compare the impacts of dogs in relationship to other factors, such as human impacts. Some commenters had an issue with the comparison between the no action alternative under little enforcement, and the action alternatives with full enforcement.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 930 **Comment Id:** 353783 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I do not see where in the SEIS there is conclusive scientific data showing that dog walkers and owners are causing damage to designated off-leash areas, which means there is no legitimate or legal foundation for these policy changes. The plan doesnt differentiate between impacts caused by humans or other animals. It just assumes all the negative impacts are caused

by dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Cindy B Potter **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3100 **Comment Id:** 357903 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The proposed ban on dogs at Ocean Beach between Stairwell 21 and Sloat Blvd is inappropriate and unjustified. The NPS is proposing a complete ban on dogs without considering enforcing the current on-leash policy. In fact, the impacts analysis section of the document compares the impacts of the current on-leash policy with little-to-no enforcement to the preferred alternative of a dog ban with enforcement. To truly compare the impacts of an on-leash policy at Ocean Beach versus a ban on dogs, the NPS would need to compare both scenarios with similar levels of enforcement.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4418 **Comment Id:** 365166 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The Park Service should revise the dog management plan to:Exclude speculative, exaggerated, biased, or misleading statements and studies. - Provide reasonable ways to address any significant adverse impacts from recreational activities. Use objective standards applicable to other recreational activities (e.g., equestrians, boaters, fishermen, surfers, bicyclists, beach-goers, joggers, walkers, etc.).
Organization:
Commenter: Carol Schlesinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6167 **Comment Id:** 365708 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic' (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ form other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6436 **Comment Id:** 367499 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: To me, the flaw in this report is that the comments about goals and considerations are equally applied to these very different spaces, even though the benefits of

public use are immensely greater in these SF city areas, and the potential improvements for habitat and wild animals are basically non-existent in these areas. Crissy Field East and West beach are mostly barren sand-scapes without any fragile vegetation, and no native wildlife. Aside from some very infrequent disturbance of the Plover habitat, these beaches are areas without any real opportunity for protection, which also provide an immense public recreational benefit. Unfortunately, the report fails to distinguish these areas from each other. In failing to do so, the report fails to provide any true appreciation for the benefits of public use - instead, preservation of habitat for plants and animals is treated s an absolute objective second to none. I think it is essential to understand that the mostly urban park circumstances of Crissy Field, Ft. Point, Ft. Mason and similar spaces MUST be considered in a different way than a trail at the top of the marin headlands, far from the noise and craziness of the city

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. Commenters felt that the document should better describe the current setting and environment of the GGNRA in relation to its larger setting within a large urban area. Some commenters noted the need for the analysis of sites to take into account their location and condition.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 632 **Comment Id:** 352776 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The document failed to properly characterize the urban setting of the GGNRA; reading the document one is left with the impression that the GGNRA is a wilderness area, and not the urban parklands of the San Francisco Bay region. The document should better characterize the general setting of the GGNRA, and the level of visitation to the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Block **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3404 **Comment Id:** 359142 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The proposal does not show what the true environmental problem is that we're trying to address. Nor does the proposal analyze the impact to the broader bay area / sf environment should the nps proposal be enacted. Consequently, this plan is unbalanced and unworthy of approval.

Organization:

Commenter: Andy Welch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6339 **Comment Id:** 365643 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Throughout this report, the authors provide arguments about policies and impacts that are reasonable for wilderness parks, but make no sense at all for a park located within the San Francisco city environment. Most importantly, there is no actual data showing

how these regulations might or might not work in a city setting. Before imposing a huge change in policy on our entire city, I would like to see some real data showing what, if any, of the intended consequences are even possible within San Francisco. The report really has no data that is relevant to the situation in San Francisco

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6407 **Comment Id:** 366285 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I find a preponderance of unsupported statements about the impact of dogs on the areas of the Recreation Area. Many of these statements make no sense to me, given the spaces that are being considered for a dramatic change in use policy. I find many statements that could be true in a remote wilderness area, but make no sense at all when placed in the context of park spaces in the middle of San Francisco. Fort Mason, for example, is within 50 meters of a Safeway, and is surrounded on 3 sides by Bay and Van Ness streets. There are fire engines, ambulances, cars, motorcycles and aircraft in the air and on the ground around Ft. Mason. . The Ft. Mason parking lot has food festivals, music festivals, a farmer's market, and many other uses. This is not a space where sensitive birds come to find undisturbed rest or where sensitive plants need to be protected from people and their pets. It is absurd to apply the standards and goals of the national parks to these areas, because there is simply no possibility of achieving the "preservation of natural habitats" that is the normal objective.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6540 **Comment Id:** 368709 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Related to this, the data collected was too limited. It did not take into account the broader urban area and what would happen in San Francisco, as a whole, if the GGNRA plan is adopted. An approach more similar to mediation of competing interests would lead to data collection that would support compromise. The present approach has been data collection in an attempt by one side to win an argument over another side.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara A Goode **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

6. **Many commenters expressed frustration that allowing dogs on-leash on more trails or off-leash on trails was not sufficiently analyzed, and that the decision to remove dogs from many trails was not based on evidence. Some commenters wished that the proposal had included an option for expanded dog use on trails.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1814 **Comment Id:** 354139 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails

has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.

Organization:

Commenter: Page Bertelsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1919 **Comment Id:** 354550 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There's no proposal for truly expanded dog use. If one is concerned about the effects of dogs on trails - then it should at least be considered that providing more acceptable trails would spread out the use and mitigate more severe effects on the currently acceptable areas. A rotation could also be considered. Limiting dogs o a small trail corridor (or a handful of trails of any mileage as proposed) will naturally increase the number of dogs on those trails and magnify the real or imagined damage.

Organization:

Commenter: David V Gainer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2642 **Comment Id:** 356965 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Organization:

Commenter: Kirsten Nusser **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3783 **Comment Id:** 359661 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Since upland areas of the Rancho are dense chaparral and inaccessible due to poison oak except by trail, the available area beyond the two fields for dog walking is limited to a few trails including those extending over the Montara Mountains through a variety of lands near the Field and the furthest reaches of the San Vicente Ridge trails above the Hayfield. It seems unreasonable to bar leashed dogs from this handful trails, as the SEIS identifies no major impacts from dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Church **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

7. **Commenters felt that the definition of voice control should be better defined, while others noted that they felt that the SEIS did not present reasons why on-leash dog walking provided additional protection. Several commenters also stated that how**

ROLAs would be defined, how mitigation would be completed, and other technical details.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 3834 **Comment Id:** 359949 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Unless you have a clear and verifiable definition of what constitutes complete and 100% oice control of a pet by a dog owner or walker. This is ambiguous and unenforceable. This should not be an acceptable method for walking dogs along the public paths. I regularly see dogs walking well behind or out of visual eye sight of owners who are distracted or focused on other things. These owners are not in control of their pet. This also creates more ambiguity making enforcement difficult since technically they may be within voice range and therefore meeting a vague definition of under voice control.

Organization:

Commenter: John Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5020 **Comment Id:** 362018 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: it is unclear what additional protection "on leash" laws have over "sight and voice-control" laws which, if properly enforced, serve the same purpose - to ensure dogs are not destroying habitat and interfering with other recreational users' experiences.

Organization:

Commenter: Genevieve Coyle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5151 **Comment Id:** 362278 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Preferred Alternative does not specify how the ROLAs will be achieved. The Preferred Alternative does not describe how park visitors will be adequately informed of the ROLA boundaries for the six sites in the Preferred Alternative F. Nor does it state that ROLAs will be fully enclosed, to guarantee that off-leash dogs are contained.

Organization: International Urban Estuary Network/Save the Bay

Commenter: Arlene Gemmill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4256 **Comment Id:** 368466 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS fails to provide evidence that voice control is an effective off-leash dog management option. While the SEIS does loosely describe and discuss the concept of voice control, it does not evaluate voice control for its degree of effectiveness, nor does it demonstrate the abilities of the general dog walking public to employ such a method. Unless it is clearly demonstrated to be as effective as the use of a leash, voice control should not be considered as an option for use in any area of the GGNRA that is open to multiple visitor uses

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew & JoAnn Zlatunich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6670 **Comment Id:** 369550 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Draft SEIS fails to include the only remedy that will ensure that off leash dog users comply with rules for a ROLA which is closure of a ROLA when it is shown that the rules are not followed and that enforcement has not significantly reduced non-compliance with the rules or has resulted in adverse environmental impacts. The Draft SEIS fails to identify the mitigation measures that will be undertaken, including closure of ROLAs, from adverse environmental impacts. For example, if after a period of monitoring it is determined that off leash walking in a ROLA has caused damage to vegetation or to species in the ROLA, the plan should provide for closure of that ROLA and other measures to restore the habitat and species. The Draft SEIS is inadequate for failing to provide this simple and effective tool for dealing with environmental damage.

Organization: Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

Commenter: Norman La Force **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

8. Commenters noted that the NPS impacts analysis was thorough, and supported the analysis completed in the SEIS.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5089 **Comment Id:** 362167 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The review provided by NPS for GGNRA is very complete and educational. As a dog owner and supporter of environmental protection, I am happy that the analyses have been as expansive as they have been.

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne Markel-Fox **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365535 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We appreciate the extensive research that went into the preparation of the Draft SEIS, especially the 24 peer reviewed studies that confirm the impact of dogs on wildlife and habitats. The findings of these studies are applicable to impacts of dogs everywhere and provide ample support for recommendations to limit dog use to protect wildlife in sensitive habitats.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

9. Commenters made suggestions about how data should be used in the SEIS, including on the use of peer-reviewed sources, and addressing limitations in studies.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368419 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Any use of the data must address the limitations of the survey methods and the fact that some species may have abandoned sites, especially smaller sites, due to off-leash dog activity over many years. The EIS needs to avoid such simplistic interpretations of the data.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368440 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS needs to relax its focus on only using peer-reviewed sources. The Department of Interior guidelines for the use of science are concerned with the integrity of the use of science. Over reliance and peer-reviewed sources that may not be relevant lacks integrity compared with judicious use of peer reviewed and other sources. There is a sufficient body of literature to describe and determine the probable level of impacts of off-leash dogs in much more detail than currently in the SEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 1011 **Comment Id:** 351426 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not do them.

Organization:

Commenter: David Nale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1066 **Comment Id:** 351517 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is evidence and testimony outside the current study but not mentioned that communities with more off leash exercise areas for dogs appear to benefit from better behaved dogs in the community overall. Has this been researched, considered or pursued as part of the decision making process in regard to community impacts? How can the study purport to have no negative impacts on the community when these aspects are ignored? And isn't there research that shows restricting dogs to small areas and overcrowding of trails with dogs leads to more acts of aggression and problems?

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen Hurley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1126 **Comment Id:** 351684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The research done to date is insufficient basis for such dramatic proposed changes, and I encourage more thorough study- -as required by law- -before any modifications to policy are enacted.

Organization:

Commenter: MaryAnne McKernie **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1132 **Comment Id:** 351690 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Permitting access to Rodeo Beach does not adequately address the issue of access for dog owners and I believe that the research to date is insufficient basis for such dramatic proposed changes

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Strogoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1156 **Comment Id:** 351783 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The planned changes are not supported by sound science nor supported from public opinion of residents and users of the areas with proposed changes.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1168 **Comment Id:** 351821 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Roberta Sarnoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1322 **Comment Id:** 352310 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Much of the Preferred Alternative sounds arbitrary such as not allowing off-leash dog walking on any trail, or on any newly acquired land, especially since there appear to be few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan A Garbuio **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1170 **Comment Id:** 351829 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have read through your proposals to severely limit off-leash areas for our dogs, and then searched for the reasoning behind them. There were no facts I could find to suggest that having dogs romp on the beach in any way threatens the wildlife or environment at Crissy Field. The dogs do not breach the cordoned off areas that are restricted nor can they get near the wildlife in the marsh on the south side of the walking path.
Organization:
Commenter: Nancy Dickson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1186 **Comment Id:** 351935 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: No scientific data supports the proposed policy changes. The SEIS assumes dogs cause negative impact on GGNRA parks but studies have revealed the opposite is true, In contrast, GGNRA Park Police reports are replete with accounts of humans littering and vandalizing GGNRA property.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeffrey and Hoa Nebenzahl and Tran **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1329 **Comment Id:** 352322 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Your proposal is not based on scientific evidence and speaks again to

government bowing to special interests.
Organization:
Commenter: Christine Templin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1339 **Comment Id:** 352350 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.
Organization:
Commenter: Kim Nguyen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 589 **Comment Id:** 352684 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly OPPOSE the GGNRA Dog Management Policy. Based on its own admission, the GGNRA has not studies or data to back up the claim that dogs inhibit visitor safety or the natural resources of the recreation area. The proposed policy is based solely on anecdotal evidence. This is extremely poor public policy.
Organization:
Commenter: kristin resnansky **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 629 **Comment Id:** 352768 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: This proposal in not based on scientific data nor is it peer reviewed.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine Meyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 638 **Comment Id:** 352794 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I feel that your plan isn't legitimate because there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site specific study completed and there is no data to support ANY of their assertions about the supposed harm that dogs are causing. Without vital monitoring, the SEIS is a sham and the NPS doesn't have any justification for a proposed draconian change from the 1979 Pet Policy of the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 661 **Comment Id:** 352843 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The premise that dogs in the GGRNA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area is absurd. By their own admission, the GGNRA has no data or studies to support these claims. They ignore/omit all studies that contradict their desired outcome. How can the GGNRA undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies (as required by federal law) as a means to identify the alleged impairment?! Anecdotal comments and the "potential" to damage the area just don't cut it.

Organization: Golden Gate Senior Services, past pres Bd of Directors (23 yrs)

Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1584 **Comment Id:** 353153 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When have any huge problems occurred. Show me the data.. usually dogs on leash have more aggression..

Organization:

Commenter: isaac n joseph **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1587 **Comment Id:** 353159 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We are obedient of and respectful of off- vs. on-leash areas and of wildlife. While I understand the need to protect other species, I would need to see convincing studies such as those mentioned above before I became convinced that a proposal such as this was in the best interests of the community as a whole.

Organization:

Commenter: Eric Plumb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3553 **Comment Id:** 353323 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Where is the evidence that these additional restrictions will provide a public benefit?

Organization:

Commenter: Peck Comstock **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 809 **Comment Id:** 353342 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It seems that the decisions are not based on any scientific data and lean heavily on assumptions and assertions that provide little firm evidence that support them. It also appears to lack any peer reviewed site specific studies that I would think would be required before taking such action. Without studies and more formal review process, there do not seem to be any legitimate or legal foundations for these policy changes. Also, the plan does not differentiate between the impact caused by human beings or other animals and assumes that all negative

impact is caused by dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Patrick McComb **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 834 **Comment Id:** 353391 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am opposed to the entire proposed GGNRA Dog Management Policy. There is no evidence or studies that show dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety or damaging the resources of the Recreation Area.
Organization:
Commenter: Greg King **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1665 **Comment Id:** 353501 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am against limiting dog access to these lands. These areas provide so much joy to the citizens of the Bay Area who have dogs. I am a strong environmentalist and I disagree with the argument that dogs are putting these lands at any more risk than poor developmental planning/growth and humans. Please keep these lands open to dogs and have defined off leash areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Terese Tatum **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1689 **Comment Id:** 353632 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: it's my understanding that site-specific, peer-reviewed studies are at least called for, if not required by law, for changes of this nature to be made. Is that really true? If so, please send me copies of the studies conducted in this matter, relative to Muir Beach, Homestead, the Headlands and the other areas which you are now considering making off-limits to us dog folks. I've not been able to find even a trace of a study on any of the properties under consideration.
Organization:
Commenter: David E Gurley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 913 **Comment Id:** 353640 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands."
Organization:
Commenter: Nicole Jordan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1762 **Comment Id:** 353745 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There has been no environmental degradation at Oakwood Valley during that time or during the nearly two decades we have taken our dog there
Organization:
Commenter: Tom and Amy Davey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 923 **Comment Id:** 353775 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific stdies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Mindy Katz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 946 **Comment Id:** 353808 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS has no peer-reviewed studies specific to our sites. It contains no information on vital monitoring (as required by law) to make such a significant change to the public's use of this public land.
Organization: citizen
Commenter: Lisa Williams **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 949 **Comment Id:** 353811 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The latest recommendations - without peer review are going too far for those responsible pet owners who love and support the countryside we live in. The SEIS initiative contains insufficient studies and monitoring and is bad for dogs, owners and the environment, as we will be forced to drive further and further afield to find alternatives.
Organization:
Commenter: Paul Parkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4599 **Comment Id:** 353839 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: Environmental degradation due to dogs is insignificant and can certainly be mitigated in minimal locations as necessary.
Organization:
Commenter: Tom Long **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4762 **Comment Id:** 353847 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: Moreover, the conclusions of the report are simply not logically derived from

the studies it cites! There is no persuasive evidence that restricting dogs will improve the site's ecology.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Chaffee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 973 **Comment Id:** 354180 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, dogs are already off-limits on a very high percentage of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining very small areas where dogs can walk. As far as we can tell, there have not been any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Leah Lazar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1878 **Comment Id:** 354421 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am strongly opposed to the the "dog management" Alternative F plan. Very little of the parks are available for dogs as it is. We frequently walk our dogs on the trails of Mill Valley and I have never encountered a dog which was destructive or out of control. Closing off trails to dogs essentially means that the people can't enjoy them either. I don't believe you have presented any solid evidence that dogs are threatening the parks or the trails.

Organization:

Commenter: Pam Kerwin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1914 **Comment Id:** 354535 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: From what I understand, the GGNRA's purpose is (or should be) to maintain urban recreational areas for Bay Area residents, and while, as an avid outdoorsperson, I am certainly concerned for the preservation of my natural surroundings, I am not at all convinced that my dog could cause a more detrimental environmental impact than humans.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicole M Turnipseed **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1919 **Comment Id:** 354552 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Limiting dogs on trails does not magically protect the environment from risk or change the inherent nature of the area. Much of the park abuts recreational lands or is former military land. It's not pristine. It's also close to multiple really big cities that provide a lot of users that do a lot of damage to trails.

Organization:

Commenter: David V Gainer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1952 **Comment Id:** 354608 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne F Schnobrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1953 **Comment Id:** 354611 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Finally, the plan doesn't allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA isn't considering off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. T
Organization:
Commenter: Carolyn Kenady **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1965 **Comment Id:** 354625 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan states a preference for on-leash areas, and I have no problem with the conversion of off-leash areas to on-leash. The justification for banning dogs from the trails altogether seems rather week however.
Organization:
Commenter: David Gainer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1965 **Comment Id:** 354626 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: while I'm sure dogs may have a negative impact on the area I also imagine that if the habitat were particularly vulnerable that people, horses, and bikes wouldn't be allowed on it. Likewise, the "integrity" mentioned is not some sort of wilderness area - but one crisscrossed by roads, people, horses, and bikes and a campsite.
Organization:
Commenter: David Gainer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1987 **Comment Id:** 354653 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: there are no studies that have proved these animals are causing undue stress on

these open spaces
Organization:
Commenter: Kimberly Draeger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2652 **Comment Id:** 354783 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: GGRNA should not be able to restrict access without factual data to backup the restriction of access to GGRA - - for more than 50 years this area has been made available for on/off leash access; why should this change now? It should not be opinion, it should be supported with data.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennie L Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2822 **Comment Id:** 354876 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Furthermore the SEIS research seems unscientific time and time again.
Organization:
Commenter: Katy Walden **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2891 **Comment Id:** 355026 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In balancing the environmental impact against the enjoyment of dog owners, there appears to be no com pelling environmental reason to keep dogs -.-. on leash or not -.-. off this federal land.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Laura Vartain **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2912 **Comment Id:** 355205 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And, by and large, there are no new environmental or safety issues that have com e into play because of dogs. Dogs are NOT what is hurting the environment or creating safety issues, etc. Focus on the real environmental and safety issues impacting our com munity.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Marshall Jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2925 **Comment Id:** 355223 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: GGNRA's new proposal is arbitrary and capricious, not based in valid science. It is also an unjustified "taking" of lands given in trust by the City of San Francisco. Is this another egregious example of Federal overreaching? This proposal should be immediately

reviewed at a higher level and rejected. ..
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Irene Rubey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2973 **Comment Id:** 355291 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There is no real justification in the SEIS for major changes, and there was insufficient response and support provided in response to com ments and questions from the com ment period from dog walkers.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: kerry lan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2975 **Comment Id:** 355296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it was developed with absolutely no scientific study of the issues that it proports to remediate. The severe restrictions that it imposes upon the public are unwarranted and overvalue a few small special interests above the recreational needs of the vast majority of Bay Area residents and wildlife.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Ross Gillfillan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2987 **Comment Id:** 355324 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The unilateral decision-making and ill-studied "proposal", not to mention the secrecy with which the SEIS is developing policy (e.g., stating the number of responses but not the content or context, the reliance upon non-peer-reviewed literature, lack of true studies of impacted areas, etc.) is anathema to our city and what it represents.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Maura Lewis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3000 **Comment Id:** 355340 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The research does not support the NPS's argument anyways.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Nicole Wright **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3008 **Comment Id:** 355349 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As for safety and environmental concerns, I don't see how dogs on leash are

any different for the environment than off - so long as they are kept out of environmentally sensitive spaces, as they are currently.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Stephanie Flores **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3015 **Comment Id:** 355358 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS still lists impacts that "might", "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jason Shulman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3128 **Comment Id:** 355389 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is also ridiculous that this management plan has been proposed without conducting appropriate studies substantiating the reasoning

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Helen Cleary **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2048 **Comment Id:** 355499 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

Organization:

Commenter: LaDonna Willems **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3887 **Comment Id:** 355632 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The burden is on the GGNRA to demonstrate how this plan would protect our environment, and self-serving statements that claim to further these interests are insufficient to over com e that burden. This plan must be narrowly tailored and clearly identify how the goals will be achieved in order for it to pass constitutional muster, and it does not do so.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Lawrence Cowen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2084 **Comment Id:** 355674 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Where are The Site Specific Peer Review Studies

Organization:
Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2092 **Comment Id:** 355684 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: THIS PLAN ADMOTS THERE ARE FEW SCIENTIFIC STUDIES THAT SHOW THE IMPACT THAT DOGS HAVE ON VEGETATION AND SOILS. A SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENT INPACT STATEMENT NEEDS TO BE BASED ON SCIENCE, NOT ANCEDOTE
Organization: Self
Commenter: Angela Sharp **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2098 **Comment Id:** 355689 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I demand that you conduct peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Tom Murphy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2099 **Comment Id:** 355693 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2109 **Comment Id:** 355735 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am writing to demand that you reinstate the ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. From all my research into the so-called environmental reasons for banning or severely limiting dogs from these and other GGNRA areas, I see no valid reason for it. And, as I said, there has not been any peer-reviewed studies to prove this.
Organization:
Commenter: Denise F Selleck **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2110 **Comment Id:** 355741 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study, AS REQUIRED BY LAW that supports such a drastic restriction of dog friendly areas. It must be proven before it is legislated!

Organization:

Commenter: Annette M Sullivan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2114 **Comment Id:** 355746 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed site-specific studies or vital monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to inititate such a dramatic change to the public use of their own public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Lindsay McCrea **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2115 **Comment Id:** 355749 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Paul Buxbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2121 **Comment Id:** 355757 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed site-specific studies or vital monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to initiate such a dramatic change to the public use of their own public lands

Organization:

Commenter: Kathy L **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2136 **Comment Id:** 355776 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

Organization:

Commenter: Rebeca E Golden **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4192 **Comment Id:** 355964 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If there were any peer reviewed, scientific studies that actually show the dogs are causing harm, I would support changes that would actually help the environment, unlike NPS's fencing off acres to the public which not only did NOT protect the bank swallows, it gave birds of prey posts on which to sit and pick off the birds. The birds that were not eaten, left.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4193 **Comment Id:** 355968 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We don't want excuses; we want site specific peer reviewed studies that prove the damage they are claiming. There are none in the SEIS. NPS has not done their job. Until then, the 1979 Pet Policy remains the law of the land.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5353 **Comment Id:** 356018 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The reasons for these restrictions (dogs destroying the environment and wildlife) are unfounded and all the responsible people who use the park lands regularly (with exception of people who just like to com plain and control) know this to be true.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Barbara Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5369 **Comment Id:** 356031 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because, as a dog owner, the joy my well-trained dog brings to me and the people in my com munity far exceeds the limited damage NPS claims she and other dogs do to OUR GGNRA. The NPS claims are widely unsupported by fact, analysis or survey. In my time spent over 15 years taking care of my past and current dog, 95% o the dog owners I encounter every day are thoughtful, respectful and environmentally conscious about how they use the park systems, including clean-up and adherence to park rules.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Nancy Castelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2214 **Comment Id:** 356809 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, there has not been a single, peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove that negative environmental impacts are not only occurring now, but that dogs

are specifically the root cause of them. We want real science not anecdotes.

Organization:

Commenter: Alita M Macias **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2237 **Comment Id:** 356853 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah A Burke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2240 **Comment Id:** 356856 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

Organization:

Commenter: Isaac West **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2607 **Comment Id:** 356866 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Then, this study fails to present hard data backing their recommendations, fails to provide any impact analysis of their recommendations, and fails to adhere to the existing 1979 court rulings. All of their options, including No Change actually reduce off-leash rights from the current conditions. No options were considered for expanding off-leash areas, which arguably could have greater positive effects.

Organization:

Commenter: art gallagher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2610 **Comment Id:** 356875 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Before ANY action is taken, the people DEMAND a broad spectrum of surveys to be taken at the actual land which is being proposed to be pet-limited.

Organization:

Commenter: Stacey Sobel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2671 **Comment Id:** 357028 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There have not been any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies-which the law requires-to support the sweeping changes proposed.
Organization:
Commenter: Steven Armstrong **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2729 **Comment Id:** 357146 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Now the NPS swoops in and BANS ALL OFF-LEASH dog walking in San Mateo County. This is on lands with a very long history of reasonable and accepted public dog use. Where is the science for this decision? The rationale? The logic? There seems to be plenty of strong-arm politics in the latest proposals, but basically zero consideration of science or the public access. Please take another look at how incredibly oppressive and restrictive the "preferred" plan is for the huge numbers of dog owners in San Mateo County.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2730 **Comment Id:** 357150 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Katie Sullins **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2739 **Comment Id:** 357157 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Consider the consequences if there are so few off lease options for all of us good pet owners
Organization:
Commenter: Michael T McDonell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2254 **Comment Id:** 357232 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions

to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.
Organization:
Commenter: Jessica N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2267 **Comment Id:** 357282 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Genovieve Gomez **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2764 **Comment Id:** 357386 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I wish you would provide more than vague and/or hearsay evidence that a huge majority of users are unhappy in the presence of dogs and their guardians.
Organization:
Commenter: Harold L Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2765 **Comment Id:** 357392 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Jacob K Lesnik **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2773 **Comment Id:** 357433 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I also would like to add that I believe there is no evidence to suggest that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any substantial negative impacts. We and almost all other dog owners I know are very conscientious of our impact on the environment. We pick up after our dog and we do not allow him to chase the wildlife, dig holes, or otherwise cause disturbances.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Ruch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357467 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The Plan consists of numerous baseless and unsubstantiated claims. There are NO EVIDENTIAL DATA to support the restriction and elimination of access to places where people have been enjoying themselves with their dogs for countless years.

Organization: Dog City Tours
Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2792 **Comment Id:** 357486 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have also learned that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Cunningham **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2795 **Comment Id:** 357492 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not limit off leashe dog activities in San Francisco parks. There are very few places all ready that offer a safe off leashe experience, and by limiting them further people and their dogs will be driven to prohibited areas where the environmental impact can be much greater.
Organization:
Commenter: Nick J Bergmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2802 **Comment Id:** 357511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA will not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.
Organization:
Commenter: Joyce Q **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2811 **Comment Id:** 357541 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The proposed 'dog management' plan reads more like a dog elimination plan. It is packed with exaggerated, inaccurate and purpose skewed statistics.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Cresanti **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2296 **Comment Id:** 357667 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:

Commenter: Linda Liebrand **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2857 **Comment Id:** 357674 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.
Organization:
Commenter: Carrie Asby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2314 **Comment Id:** 357733 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Another concern I have is that SEIS lacks scientific data. Instead, it makes assumptions and assertions with absolutely no peer reviewed site-specific studies as required by law. Without these studies and corresponding data, there is no legitimate or legal foundation for these policy changes. The plan doesn't differentiate between impacts caused by humans or other animals. It just assumes all the negative impacts are caused by dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: wendy E Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3036 **Comment Id:** 357750 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Furthermore the NPS/GGNRA has not conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Corinne L Valentine **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2322 **Comment Id:** 357752 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.
Organization:
Commenter: Joseph W Lisella **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2323 **Comment Id:** 357762 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

Organization:
Commenter: Alison Sumner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3106 **Comment Id:** 357910 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the SEIS preferred Dog Management Plan because there is no Site Specific Scientific Peer Review that by law is the first thing that must be done!
Organization: Ocean Beach Dog
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3212 **Comment Id:** 357984 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Before removing (or reducing by 90%) ss to dog walking in the GGNRA, the burden of proof is on the NPS to provide site-specific, peer-reviewed studies to show that impacts are caused by dogs!!!! You've NOT done that.
Organization:
Commenter: NA NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3232 **Comment Id:** 358005 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: chelsea hardaway **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3310 **Comment Id:** 358124 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There have been no factual studies of dog impacts to the areas in question - and as the area has been open to dogs for decades the habitat is obviously surviving, and thriving, in its current state.
Organization: Montara Dog Group
Commenter: Grant Weiss **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3343 **Comment Id:** 358192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.
Organization:

Commenter: Ian Gover **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3389 **Comment Id:** 358308 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My understanding is that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study, as required by law, that supports this plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Molly Hartle **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2372 **Comment Id:** 358426 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Joyce M Wang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2386 **Comment Id:** 358878 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The seis contains no peer review.. site studies or vital monetoring..
Organization:
Commenter: J stivalet **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2389 **Comment Id:** 358882 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Firstly, there is no hard evidence that the current situation has had any environmental impact. There has been no study as required by law that demonstrates any impact.
Organization:
Commenter: Robert I Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2444 **Comment Id:** 358944 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, has there been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas?
Organization:
Commenter: Theresa Ruppe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2451 **Comment Id:** 358953 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Moreover, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as

required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The SEIS document admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show how these areas are affected by the presence of dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), and instead cites anecdotal observations made by National Park Service staff. However, such anecdotal claims have no validity and cannot be used to set policy. I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies (as required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

Organization:

Commenter: Edgar P Bowron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2453 **Comment Id:** 358958 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: have also learned that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. It seems to me, as a result of this information, that this plan is ill-considered and should not be adopted as a result.

Organization: WaveWorks Coaching

Commenter: Anne Moellering **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2464 **Comment Id:** 358969 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have also learned that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. It seems to me, as a result of this information, that this plan is ill-considered and should not be adopted as a result.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Rumsey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2476 **Comment Id:** 358980 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: GGNRA's new proposal is arbitrary and capricious, not based in valid science. It is also an unjustified "taking" of lands given in trust by the City of San Francisco. Is this another egregious example of Federal overreaching? I am requesting this proposal should be immediately reviewed at a higher level and rejected

Organization:

Commenter: Irene Rubey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2518 **Comment Id:** 359019 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: An un-exercised dog is an unhappy dog and an unhappy dog-owner. From what I have read there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that

supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer L Ware **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2538 **Comment Id:** 359059 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Additionally, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as I understand it this is required by law) that supports such a restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Seth Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2543 **Comment Id:** 359067 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There has not been a single peer-reviewed, site specific study that supports such drastic restrictions in dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Janet A Magnuson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2554 **Comment Id:** 359075 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Jane CotÃ©-Cook **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2555 **Comment Id:** 359078 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Vicki Barbara Stein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2578 **Comment Id:** 359110 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.
Organization:
Commenter: Allison J Bloodworth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2579 **Comment Id:** 359113 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael E Miner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3437 **Comment Id:** 359231 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: THIS IS KEY: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. This simply put looks like a major land grab of the Federal Government from my perspective.
Organization:
Commenter: Joan House **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3745 **Comment Id:** 359442 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Proponents of these changes provide no evidence whatsoever that A) these areas need any sort of further protection from dogs, or that B) changing access to dogs will have any environmental impact whatsoever.
Organization:
Commenter: Mark Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3779 **Comment Id:** 359570 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: WHERE ARE THE SiTE SPECiFiC PEER REViEWs THERE ARE NON THERE iS A LAW THAT REQUiRES THiS.
Organization:
Commenter: NA Anonymous **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4011 **Comment Id:** 359589 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a severe restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Robyn A Leonard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3831 **Comment Id:** 359939 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It's a tough sell to say that this bill will decrease environmental impact, when dog owners are by and large the segment of the population that cares for the environment. This is, of course, my opinion and I don't have hard facts to back it up, but I feel pretty confident that it is true.
Organization:
Commenter: T.J. N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4027 **Comment Id:** 359968 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: - The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring, as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Alan B Mullendore **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3943 **Comment Id:** 360109 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the GGNRA's plan to ban dogs off leash. I have not seen any Valid studies explaining why we must take this fantastic part of enjoying our City away from so many people and dogs.
Organization: me
Commenter: Kathy E Sabatino **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3958 **Comment Id:** 360185 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: there is not enough evidence that dogs are impacting the area in a negative way
Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth Tausend **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4035 **Comment Id:** 360269 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: it admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.
Organization:
Commenter: Kristen Aramthanapon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4510 **Comment Id:** 360458 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: D. Kathryn Tierney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4531 **Comment Id:** 360485 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRAs original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan fails to do.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Cone **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4534 **Comment Id:** 360489 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not believe the GGNRA analysis is accurate. We should continue to allow dogs access to Fort Zfunston, Chrissy Field and the Presidio. Dogs are an important part of the civic experience,

Organization:

Commenter: Julie M Holloway **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4536 **Comment Id:** 360491 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.

Organization:

Commenter: Donna L Bonifield **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4550 **Comment Id:** 360581 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I would happily pay a yearly or day use fee in order to make sure the land and space was being cared for and supported. There has been know evidence presented that says that dogwalkers are affecting the land or wildlife in a negative way.

Organization:

Commenter: Dusty Lombardo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4584 **Comment Id:** 360985 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Carboy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4590 **Comment Id:** 361084 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: jennifer l hooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4595 **Comment Id:** 361111 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a scientist, and do not see the validity of statements about dog impact on wildlife and plants. This issue needs to be addressed in order to impose measures such as proposed. I believe it is a legal requirement for Federal Government to make policy changes, where it invokes scientific statements, to present peer reviewed studies. That has not been presented. ie. how are dogs impacting areas with proposed changes in access.
Organization:
Commenter: Natalie D DeWitt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4595 **Comment Id:** 361112 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If these policies take effect, the small existing parks that allow dogs will be inundated. There are more dogs in San Franscisco than children. Dogs are adored by this population. How does plan take into account shifting demographics, importance of dogs for human health, and the importance of exercise and time spent with dogs as important paradigm in human health?
Organization:
Commenter: Natalie D DeWitt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4644 **Comment Id:** 361172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:

Commenter: John Delaplane **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4687 **Comment Id:** 361328 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It appears that the SEIS is a fatally flawed document with no peer-reviewed, site specific monitoring or data and that there is no legitimate or legal basis for the proposed changes.
Organization:
Commenter: David C Heughan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4731 **Comment Id:** 361404 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I do not accept the reasons for the proposed plan as the research is not conclusive about the effect of dog walking on these recreation areas.
Organization:
Commenter: caroline beeler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4115 **Comment Id:** 361455 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I also understand that there hasn't been a peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Monika Fedalen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4115 **Comment Id:** 361456 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. It only lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, but doesn't provide site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA
Organization:
Commenter: Monika Fedalen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4781 **Comment Id:** 361516 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single site-specific study (as required by law) that supports a restriction of our current dog-friendly public real estate.
Organization:
Commenter: Katherine Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4785 **Comment Id:** 361523 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that the supports the drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas that the preferred alternative would impose.

Organization:

Commenter: Laurie Berk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4795 **Comment Id:** 361552 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore the SEIS does not provide substantial and specific evidence that restricting dog walking will provide a significant benefit. Therefore the best course of action is to continue with the 1979 Pet Policy that is currently in place.

Organization:

Commenter: Kenji Okamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4810 **Comment Id:** 361575 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It would be so helpful to know why, exactly, dogs are considered so detrimental to the parks environment, and then perhaps dog owners would not feel so persecuted. As it stands, I feel like my little dog, my outbound poop bags and my innocent little week-end walks are being victimized for no reason.

Organization:

Commenter: Erika Bodo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4848 **Comment Id:** 361627 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am very much opposed to the Draft Dog Management Plan. It appears to be responding to anecdotal information. There are no hard data to support this change.

Organization:

Commenter: Ilene Philipson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4892 **Comment Id:** 361708 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.

Organization:

Commenter: Alexis Chase **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4898 **Comment Id:** 361733 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Peer reviewed studies are needed and these have not been done at the sites in question. Therefore, every anecdotal observation of impacts, especially where the impact was not quantified and where it is based on already biased NPS staff, should be stricken from the SEIS. Opinion surveys, such as 2008 visitor use survey at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, which are not rigorously controlled for observer bias, are similarly invalid for the sake of public policy.
Organization:
Commenter: sanford goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4907 **Comment Id:** 361762 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SF is a city full of loving responsible dog-owners, and I don't understand why this new plan doesn't reflect the importance of our feedback... not to mention there haven't been any peer-reviewed, site-specific study, as required by law, to support such a draconian measure.
Organization:
Commenter: Barry R Perlman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4933 **Comment Id:** 361795 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: What is it they do not understand about Recreation and the Urban Environment, ignoring any and all comments that would be a positive for dogs off-leash or on leash. How do they figure that dogs are having such a negative impact on the lands that are in GGNRA? More people are coming to these areas since they have taken over, does this not cause more of a negative impact...why just dogs?
Organization:
Commenter: Beverly Miller **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4938 **Comment Id:** 361799 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I believe the SEIS should by law include peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Jody Coker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4948 **Comment Id:** 361814 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am also concerned that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:
Commenter: Troy W **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4952 **Comment Id:** 361821 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of off-leash, dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Steven Lanum **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4959 **Comment Id:** 361840 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: sarah Bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4975 **Comment Id:** 361882 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This is not sufficient for making a conclusion, but these are the kind of data that you (the NPS) have used so far in bolstering your "preferred" alternative. The lack of data in the literature supporting canine-caused resource degradation coupled with the absence of site specific data for GGNRA leave these restrictions completely unsubstantiated.
Organization: Sierra Club
Commenter: Annemarie A Donjacour **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4982 **Comment Id:** 361888 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a resident of the Bay Area, I too am concerned about the long-term preservation of the GGNRA's natural resources and want to protect these natural resources as well. The DEIS notes some studies and the perception of dogs and the harmful impact on our natural resources, but there is little site-specific documentation to support the proposed restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Carol Selsted **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4986 **Comment Id:** 361893 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It appears that the SEIS is a fatally flawed document with no peer-reviewed,

site specific monitoring or data and that there is no legitimate or legal basis for the proposed changes.

Organization: Private individual

Commenter: Lee Heughan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4994 **Comment Id:** 361899 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: R Pickman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361912 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA does not use sound principles of land use planning and management or even follow their own rules and regulations.The premise that dogs in the GGRNA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area is absurd. By their own admission, the GGNRA has no data or studies to support these claims. They ignore/omit all studies that contradict their desired outcome.

Organization:

Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361918 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: How can the GGNRA undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies (as required by federal law) as a means to identify the alleged impairment?! Anecdotal comments and the "potential" to damage the area just don't cut it.

Organization:

Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5004 **Comment Id:** 361926 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is neither adequate evidence nor basis in any original mission statement that should restrict access by well-behaved dogs on leash or under voice control.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Quinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361979 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361984 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Regarding Visitor Use and Experience, on pages 1090 -1091 This misleading paragraph implies that all local residents allow their dogs to roam the beach unsupervised. This is a false and unsupported statement. Residents legally allow their dogs off-leash, and these dogs are supervised. Off-leash does not mean unsupervised.

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5020 **Comment Id:** 362016 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: the plan for such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas is not supported by any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies (as required by law) and instead is based on conjecture and speculation of "impacts"

Organization:

Commenter: Genevieve Coyle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5039 **Comment Id:** 362032 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: kate N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4122 **Comment Id:** 362052 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Organization:

Commenter: Duane Ernst **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5049 **Comment Id:** 362114 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes in the 2013 seis are not founded by any data nor addressing the criticism expressed in 2011.
Organization:
Commenter: Ben Hobson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5021 **Comment Id:** 362128 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne Rowe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5065 **Comment Id:** 362146 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: there are so many other element for destroying nature i don't think it's the dogs walking few leash free areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Mina k Jackson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5138 **Comment Id:** 362270 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There is no evidence that off-leash dog walking has any negative impacts, yet this plan is a major restriction of off-leash dog walking that has existed for decades.
Organization:
Commenter: Kate Gruen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5163 **Comment Id:** 362297 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4239 **Comment Id:** 362309 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4263 **Comment Id:** 362336 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. Therefore these are speculative claims. The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdotes.
Organization:
Commenter: Kim Dang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4270 **Comment Id:** 362344 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: am opposed to the Preferred Alternative because the plan lists impacts that "might", "can", or "could" happen while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits that the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegitation and soils.
Organization:
Commenter: Charmagne Kringstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5177 **Comment Id:** 362453 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.
Organization:
Commenter: Angeline Yap **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5188 **Comment Id:** 362538 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am particularly distressed that this plan did not conduct any peer-reviewed,

site-specific studies that provide support for this execessive restiction of public use on OUR public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Alice A Gleghorn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5196 **Comment Id:** 362571 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I would like to see the record of documented objections to dogs at GGNLR sites, a record that substantiates/supports the GGNLR's changes in policy.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5202 **Comment Id:** 362593 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is hard to imagine, even after reading the SEIS, how dogs could be significantly problematic for wildlife over and above the impact of the human impact in these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Johannes Rothlind **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5205 **Comment Id:** 362598 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Never did the park service do any research on use. Had they done so they would realize that the majority of daily users are dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristin A Van Til **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5206 **Comment Id:** 362604 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, we have read that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Noelle G Gibbs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5210 **Comment Id:** 362610 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

Organization:
Commenter: Barbara Lazarow **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5257 **Comment Id:** 362825 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA preferred option is not balanced in its approach, which is not surprising given the GGNRA history of stripping dog owners of their rights. The GGNRA is making these recommendations citing environment reason and user conflict issues. The environmental claims are lacking the backing of peer reviewed scientific studies. Based on my experience walking in Rancho I do not believe the user conflict issues are significant.
Organization:
Commenter: James S Cowdery **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5262 **Comment Id:** 362832 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I do not think the GGNRA has any evidence to support the rule change. Although dogs are seen by the service as a nuisance or potential threat to other users or wildlife there is no data to support this view. Furthermore, no studies or peer-review have been solicited to determine whether there are any negative effects from dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Colleen Lenihan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5278 **Comment Id:** 362867 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5294 **Comment Id:** 362909 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Anna Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5306 **Comment Id:** 362937 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A great many people and their family pets depend on these areas for exercise and mental recharge from the pressures of everyday city life. Why is it that we should support your work if we can find no relief or recreation in this park? Everything in moderation; nothing to excess. Your new plan for dogs and their owners is excessively restrictive for poor reasons and dubious science.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert M Hanssen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5346 **Comment Id:** 362992 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please don't further reduce the places dogs can go....this has gotten out of control in recent years. The rare occasions of problems don't justify this. I am not a dog owner, but am definitely a dog lover and truly enjoy seeing dogs when I go trail running or hiking

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah Rusby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5362 **Comment Id:** 363015 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have laws that require us to bag our pets excrement and no proof that this law s not being followed.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5387 **Comment Id:** 363035 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are no studies differentiating impacts as human or dog caused. The SEIS is biased against dogs, and is sloppy science.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah L. **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5448 **Comment Id:** 363293 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Heather Dooley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4324 **Comment Id:** 363778 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I oppose the GGNRA plan to severely limit off-leash areas in Bay Area parks.

Responsible dog owners have the right to use set aside land for recreational use with their dogs. There is no specific study supporting the need of a new plan and the GGNRA should present such data before trying to introduce changes.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4329 **Comment Id:** 363782 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I strongly believe that current heavy handed and unnecessary plans by the NPS to radically reduce off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA grossly overestimate the effect dogs have on park habitat and will be seen as a historic black-eye for NPS policy and management.

Organization:

Commenter: Tom Dallman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4359 **Comment Id:** 363803 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In general, if the NPS is unable to provide evidence that the proposed policy change will have the intended effect, they should be prevented from imposing the policy change.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5499 **Comment Id:** 363880 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Organization: self employed dog trainer

Commenter: Aleen Vorhies **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5506 **Comment Id:** 363884 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In hundreds of trips to Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Marin Headland and other GGNRA areas, we have never seen any cause or justification for the restrictive plan being formulated. We want to strongly express our objection to any restrictive or containment plans that would prevent our family from enjoying the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Kent Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5545 **Comment Id:** 363919 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no scientific evidence to what you are claiming- -I've reviewed it with

several of my fellow birder friends, some of whom are not dog owners, as well as an environmental scientist. I'm at that beach and field multiple times a week, and I have only once seen someone let their dog into the bird sanctuary, and I promptly called park police to handle it.

Organization:

Commenter: Melinda Byerley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5572 **Comment Id:** 363959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I frequent Fort Funston every week and have been for 10 years with my dogs. This is one of the best places for off leash dogs. I actually do not understand the reason for any ban on off leash dogs? In all my time spent there I have never seen a major altercation between dogs or dogs and humans. So why the ban?

Organization:

Commenter: Eric Chapman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5589 **Comment Id:** 363976 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This has been an important part of the Bay Area for many decades, we police ourselves and require very little from you. The reasons you have stated for banning this activity are specious at best.

Organization:

Commenter: Ted Helminski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5659 **Comment Id:** 364087 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: elizabeth cavagnaro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4373 **Comment Id:** 364125 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan includes many unsubstantiated assumptions and implications that must be substantiated.

Organization:

Commenter: Judie L Doherty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5763 **Comment Id:** 364260 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am against the current proposal. The proposal to drastically reduce the amount

of off-leash areas for dogs in the city is misguided, and a reversal of course set years ago. Where are the driving factors that require such a drastic change to current policy? The data provided by the GGNRA simply do not merit such drastic changes.

Organization:

Commenter: Kevin Ivanovic **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5791 **Comment Id:** 364305 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I completely oppose this plan that will not allow off-leash dog walking anywhere in the GGNRA. This plan is sad and irresponsible to the people that enjoy these parks the most - the typical Marin residents that have been bringing their dogs on trails in this area for decades. I just don't find there is enough specific evidence of negative impact compelling enough to punish us for what has been (to date) completely responsible enjoyment of these parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Chris N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5824 **Comment Id:** 364364 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have seen no study that documents the positive effects of these restrictions. I can see major noncompliance and civil disobedience if the principal users of this urban park are restricted for no clear purpose.

Organization:

Commenter: James W Moyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5844 **Comment Id:** 364387 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA/NPS is basing this plan on limited anecdotal complaints by biased organizations (GGNPC, etc) and individuals rather than on sound science consisting of site-specific, peer-reviewed studies.

Organization:

Commenter: Dianne N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5847 **Comment Id:** 364397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura I Ducoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364482 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I also notice that, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5897 **Comment Id:** 364497 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We demand that the GGNRA provides a factual report before any legislation is passed.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrei Ferrera **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5926 **Comment Id:** 364652 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have yet to hear a good reason why dogs will be banned from most or all of GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Jean F DeMouthe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5940 **Comment Id:** 364685 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: So far, I have not seen any scientific evidence produced by the NPS supporting the fact that dogs are detrimental to the wildlife in the area. There is no basis for such drastic restrictions.
Organization:
Commenter: Denise M Lamott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6000 **Comment Id:** 364875 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am told that there has been no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of our public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: greg t jackson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6011 **Comment Id:** 364952 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynette Rosenblum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6028 **Comment Id:** 364999 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Rhodes Klement **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4426 **Comment Id:** 365200 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Rachel R Carney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4432 **Comment Id:** 365223 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: andrew and nanci scoular **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4469 **Comment Id:** 365355 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Jordan Hinkes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4472 **Comment Id:** 365360 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne M Crosthwaite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4478 **Comment Id:** 365372 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: anette cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4492 **Comment Id:** 365402 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The Park Service should revise the dog management plan to: â–ª Exclude speculative, exaggerated, biased, or misleading statements and studies. â–ª Provide reasonable ways to address any significant adverse impacts from recreational activities. Use objective standards applicable to other recreational activities (e.g., equestrians, boaters, fishermen, surfers, bicyclists, beach-goers, joggers, walkers).
Organization:
Commenter: Susan E Dolder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4493 **Comment Id:** 365409 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Your preferred alternative/plan is overly restrictive and is not based on a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas as required by law.
Organization:
Commenter: Pavla Sim **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6101 **Comment Id:** 365416 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: After almost three years and two draft plans comprising a combined 4,300 pages ,where is the scientific study conducted at Fort Funston or any other recreational unit in the GGNRA? There are few, if any, scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so the plan cites anecdotal observations of impacts made by National Park Service Staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An EIS is expected to be based on science, not anecdote.
Organization:
Commenter: Dave Emanuel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6112 **Comment Id:** 365429 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: chris L hackler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6116 **Comment Id:** 365463 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am disappointed that " SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word.
Organization:
Commenter: SUSAN OBAYASHI **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6315 **Comment Id:** 365497 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands".
Organization:
Commenter: David Lehr **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6319 **Comment Id:** 365515 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Stacy Patterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6140 **Comment Id:** 365599 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I disagree that the goal of the NPS should be to absolutely minimize impacts without concern for public use. In the case of the GGNRA which is a public park situated in the middle of a dense urban population, the value of public use is MUCH HIGHER than in a remote park. The NPS wants to use exactly the same analysis on Crissy Field as it would use on a beach in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. However, it should be obvious that the potential benefits

associated with public use at Crissy Field are immensely different than they would be on a remote beach in a wilderness. Therefore, a different analysis, based on the obviously different value opportunity, should be used.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6149 **Comment Id:** 365626 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For comparison, the NPS intends to impose other policy changes on the GGNRA, such as elimination of off-leash walking in many areas without any particular evidence that the policy change will have beneficial impacts, and ignoring the substantial reduction in opportunities for public enjoyment and, all the while, admitting that the proposed changes will come with a significant increase in the costs of management.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6334 **Comment Id:** 365633 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan doesn't reflect comments submitted by thousands of people who responded with legitimate concerns and objections to the first plan. Residents are still waiting for the legally required peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports the proposed drastic restriction of areas where we may recreate with our pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Barrows **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6166 **Comment Id:** 365695 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: People enjoy their dogs off-leash, and dogs are better behaved around other dogs when off-leash. The proposed provisions are totally unnecessary for the protection of the wildlife and the flora. The provisions are not based on legitimate scientific studies.

Organization:

Commenter: Morton J Stein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6169 **Comment Id:** 365719 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic' (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ form other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.

Organization:
Commenter: Danielle Kirby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6684 **Comment Id:** 365766 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released.
Organization:
Commenter: Erin Tom Nowell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6363 **Comment Id:** 365804 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am further angered by the fact that they are proposing these changes without hard research and facts, and without engaging the government and citizens of the City of San Francisco, as well as those of the other affected cities.
Organization:
Commenter: Nicole Kurth **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6368 **Comment Id:** 365809 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of THEIR public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: sherry gooltz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6196 **Comment Id:** 365998 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas
Organization:
Commenter: Chloe Kirby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6391 **Comment Id:** 366054 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS makes a number of general statements about the negative impact of dogs. The SEIS fails to present any site specific evidence of these impacts caused by dogs on soil, vegetation, and wildlife. The SEIS needs to show evidence that dogs have negative impacts on site specific soil, vegetation, and wildlife to justify restrictions on dog activity. The SEIS is

full of possible impacts of dogs on wildlife and vegetation and other visitors that 'could' occur, but there is little evidence that these impacts do occur. The SEIS should base its management plan of actual observed impacts. The SEIS uses anecdotal evidence of negative impact of dogs as a way of supporting the proposed changes. In science, a common statement is that the plural of anecdote is not data. Any proposed rule changes that are meant to limit the recreational use of a GGNRA site must be based on data showing a negative environmental impact. Anecdotes do not meet this standard of proof. Furthermore, these points were raised by comments in the DEIS and should have been addressed in the SEIS and were not.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeffrey A Ubersax **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6240 **Comment Id:** 366165 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicole D H **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6241 **Comment Id:** 366172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What I do not believe is that there is legitimate, UNBIASED scientific evidence that offleash areas are threatening wildlife. I would be more concerned with parades, races and generally irresponsible park attendees who leave trash, fires, etc and have no incentive to keep these spaces in tact.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine B Brumback **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6257 **Comment Id:** 366218 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not provide any peer reviewed site specific study on areas affected by dogs. Yet some of the proposals would cut access to people with dogs by over 90%. is not in any way sound decision making for public policy.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366253 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Although public comments for the 2011 DEIS were roughly 3:1 opposed to reducing access for dogs in the GGNRA, the authors of the SEIS overwhelmingly chose to quote comments from those supporting the proposed restrictions to the dog policy. The report repeatedly cites the same handful of irrelevant studies with no bearing on the question of dogs in

the GGNRA specifically, the Seeing Eye Guide 2011 being a particularly egregious example. Worse than non-peer-reviewed studies, the report relies heavily on anecdotal reports and observations by park staff (the very definition of bias) without demonstrating such observations were done in any sort of systematic way. Often the SEIS refers to negative consequences that could or might occur without even a minimal effort to justify such a view or confirm its likelihood. The SEIS is full of seemingly unreasonable statements about the burdens dogs in the GGNRA place on staff and resources-for instance, citing the cost and labor required to collect garbage from garbage cans, which strikes me as a legitimate responsibility of a public park regardless of whether it is a human or a dog who creates the garbage

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6286 **Comment Id:** 366422 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I briefly reviewed the 1,500 page GGNRA plan to revise dog management policy. As a taxpayer I was appalled to find that an administrative project of such scale, undertaken at my expense, was not based on statistics or scientific evidence of any substantial problem. Please register my opposition to change in the current policy, and my strong dissatisfaction with the process surrounding the proposal.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6287 **Comment Id:** 366428 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I feel that the concerns regarding environmental damage are unproven over any long term. I've taken the time to read the 335 page commentary from a couple of years ago and find no 'evidence' to support that dogs damage the concerned areas in any way more or less than humans or the natural environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Seth Feigenbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6616 **Comment Id:** 367222 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no reason to blame dogs in areas when they didn't do any thing and you didn't see any proof of them being naughty

Organization:

Commenter: Michaella Ravelo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6617 **Comment Id:** 367227 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our dogs need exercised and a place to have fun is there even proof that dogs

are making a mess. Please don't pass the law

Organization:

Commenter: Rafael na **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6630 **Comment Id:** 367501 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not agree with the GGNRAï¿½ T5M current preferred alternative as it significantly restricts and eliminates off-leash dog walking in many areas within the GGNRA. The proposed changes to the existing conditions (1979 Pet Policy) and to the new lands in San Mateo County are not based upon sound science or long-term monitoring of site-specific conditions.

Organization:

Commenter: Francine Fillice **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: These proposed restrictions (only 7 of the 22 areas proposed would allow dog walking access on GGNRA lands in all three counties), in turn, will likely increase user conflict because of the limited remaining space for dog recreation. For example, the proposal to have dogs on leashes at places like Baker Beach or Muir Beach will simply not work and is unrealitisic. And there is no factual or scientific basis in closing off leash dog walking at East Beach or the Grassy Airfield at Crissy Field nor at any of the areas under consideration. What dog can you take to the beach and not have them romp and have fun? Dogs and people need socialization for a healthy and happy lifestyle.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6500 **Comment Id:** 367591 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. There do not appear to be any site-specific studies showing that off-leash dogs harm public recreation areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Todd Latham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6501 **Comment Id:** 367593 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in

response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Tushar Prabhakar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6507 **Comment Id:** 367604 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There has not been any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or science-based monitoring, as should be required by law, before effecting these large-scale changes to the public use of the lands. The public is against these changes, 3 to 1, as shown in the comments to the 2011 plan. I'll bet those numbers are even higher now in opposition to the current plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Scott A Stender **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6511 **Comment Id:** 367631 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Sergei Lubensky **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6518 **Comment Id:** 367650 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: According to Parade Magazine 2012 Survey, 42% o households nationwide have a dog. The SEIS does not consider the continued growth of the population surrounding their lands. San Francisco asked the GGNRA to investigate the effect the reduction in off-leash areas would have on city parks and were ignored. How can a supposed EIS not study that?

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Stafford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 368000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The ongoing machinations of the GGNRA to divest itself of the offleash recreational mandate which is part of its birthright is nothing less than controversial, and has already resulted in a number of court cases and decisions against the GGNRA. The changes that the GGNRA wants to put into effect with regard to the dog management plan are controversial, and yet the bases for those changes are not predicated on rigorous scientific assessment (peer-reviewed site specific data), according to the SEIS itself Such assessment must be done as a basis for a document such as the SEIS, if the GGNRA is to maintain any credibility whatsoever.

Organization:
Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6644 **Comment Id:** 368172 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in the latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdates - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last EIS was released.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathryn Nyrop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368232 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Historically, Rancho has been used by equestrians (many with off leash dogs), bikers and hikers along with off leash dog walkers. There are no facts, studies, or scientific data that support restricting the recreation of off- leash dog walking over the other types of recreation enjoyed by park visitors. We have all managed to successfully share the space for all of our preferred activities.
Organization:
Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6679 **Comment Id:** 368259 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: How do you know that it's the dogs? Their is no proof. I't could be homeless. It's bad to blame dog's it's not their falt.
Organization:
Commenter: Mariana na **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 550 **Comment Id:** 368319 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Where As: Federal law requires site-specific, peer reviewed studies to justify and guide changes in management of National Park System resources. Â¨ Where As:The SEIS acknowledges the GGNRA has no such site-specific, peer reviewed studies for the impact of dogs and their guardians on water quality, vegetation, soils and wildlife in the GGNRA.
Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 550 **Comment Id:** 368324 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In short, site-specific, peer reviewed studies are required to justify and guide

changes in management of National Park System resources. Clearly, the failure of GGNRA management to conduct any consistent monitoring or study of the resources in the GGNRA is a violation of Federal law. This SEIS highlights the fact that GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation for this park property. GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes.

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 599 **Comment Id:** 368342 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Cited studies use terms like may affect and possible disturbance from dogs. Thats not very conclusive.

Organization:

Commenter: Timothy Finan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 768 **Comment Id:** 368351 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristin Lamoureux **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Any claim about the health or community benefits of off-leash dog walking should be given the context of the costs to others in the community who may be negatively impacted by off-leash dog activity in GGNRA. What about all the other types of activities in GGNRA that foster physical activity and social community: jogging, biking, fishing, horseback riding, picnicking, etc? Law enforcement data suggests that those engaging in physical activity in GGNRA, such as playing, jogging or biking, have an increased risk of being bitten by or attacked by off leash dogs, and the presence of offleash dogs probably reduces the access to GGNRA for people who want to engage in these activities. If Cull et al. 2008 is cited, there should also be references to articles on the potential benefits of an increase in physical activity reaLIzed by providing safe and accessible places for other types of physical activities besides

walking dogs, such as running, biking, nature observation, etc., and a discussion of the potential negative impact on these activities by off-leash dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368441 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As I described in detail in my comments to the initial draft EIS, off-leash dogs frequently chase flocks of shorebirds for great distances along the tide line. This impact is so severe and obvious that there is little relevant scientific literature on a bird populations chronically affected by off-leash dogs to a similar degree, because off-leash dogs are usually banned in beach environments that have significant shorebird populations. It is not difficult for someone with knowledge of shorebird biology to discuss the degree of the disturbance and the potential impact on shorebirds of the disturbance obseried at Ocean Beach. However, this is not done in the SEIS, probably leaving most readers questioning why it is important to prohibit off-leash activity where sensitive bird populations occur.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 2186 **Comment Id:** 368483 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am against the entire Dog Management Plan. You are required by law to have Site Specific Peer Review Studies used to prove your assertions that our dogs are harming any wildlife, habitat for wildlife, or vegetation in the GGNRA. Where are they? They need to be made public by law.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan L Adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6495 **Comment Id:** 368672 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the "Preferred Alternative " to in almost every area outlined in the SEIS. I have previous commented on the lack of scientific data (Comments to DEIS 2011) supporting the " Preferred Alternatives". Furthermore, instead of a graded and graduated approach across limited numbers of GGNRA areas - a strategy that would allow pertinent scientific data to be generated while giving communities/managers and users to explore/evaluate changes- the NPS proposes huge restrictions on decades-long dog use covering most of the GGNRA areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Scott Stawicki **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6544 **Comment Id:** 368698 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In regards to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, I am primarily concerned about the lack of specificity and documentation of the negative impacts dogs have on the areas. I am often impressed with how well within the areas are organized by the GGNRA to limit the negative human and pet impact on the areas. I keep myself and my dog out of designated protected areas and observe that other visitors do the same out of respect, enjoyment and desire to preserve the GGNRA and what it offers us every time we visit. If the negative environmental impact can be better measured and specified, I am confident that dog-owners can better participate in reducing or eliminating that impact while preserving off-leash privileges.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary-Lynn Garrett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6549 **Comment Id:** 368703 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: there's no proof that dogs are causing damage.

Organization:

Commenter: Maurice Ali **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1071 **Comment Id:** 368733 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. A SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the "best professional judgment of NPS staff" to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for "proof" that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Janet Slissman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1137 **Comment Id:** 368739 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. -The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth B Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1138 **Comment Id:** 368745 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. -The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.
Organization:
Commenter: Mario Yovkov **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1139 **Comment Id:** 368754 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. -The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.
Organization:
Commenter: Alan Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1236 **Comment Id:** 368758 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soil. (p. 373.) Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them. (e.g., p.97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring. * SEIS says that during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In the same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not to do them. * SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), (which are required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the publics use of their public lands), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no

context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a longstanding, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368778 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRA hides behind a faï¿½ade of science with many citations in the SEIS document and 30 pages of references. But examination of the references usually finds no science there.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368781 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The GGNRAs Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) states in several places that it is not a scientific document, and that science will not decide policy. On the other hand, the SEIS emphasizes that NPS staff have done a thorough review of existing credible scientific literature on dogs and recreation. The countless citations to papers would seem to indicate that the GGNRA believes that science does, if fact, support their policy choices. The GGNRA wants to have it both ways: 1) Science supports them, and 2) They are not bound by science. In fact GGNRA will do what it pleases and ignore science except for its cynical presentation of a scientific veneer. I cant possibly check all GGNRAs citations. But the SEIS cites some sources that I am familiar with, and the SEIS uses those sources inaccurately.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369195 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Because the SEIS does not recognize recreational resources as an environmental resource, the analysis of the environmentally preferable alternative is flawed. Recreation is identified in the GGNRA enabling legislation as one of the four outstanding values to be maintained and protected. In doing so, the enabling legislation recognizes that the achievement of these outstanding values is not mutually exclusive.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369200 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The flaws listed above will be highlighted by further analysis of the Western Snowy Plover at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, the Bank Swallow at Fort Funston, Sweeney Ridge, Mori Point, Muir Beach and review of trails in Marin County. We would point out that flawed studies without peer review have been utilized in the interim between the Federal Court's reinstatement of the 1979 Pet Policy and this DEIS/SEIS to implement access restrictions at Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and other sites. All of these closures were unlawful which is why we insist the original 1979 Pet Policy be reinstated and codified as a Section Seven Special Regulation at this time. Additionally, new sites added since 1979 must have appropriate studies and peer review before historical usage is modified.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369489 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What was included in the SEIS was again anecdotal evidence gleaned from Comments on the DEIS, placed into the record to draw inferences but contradicted by data/science we provided in our comment on the DEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6557 **Comment Id:** 369554 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Furthermore, assumptions made by the new plan regarding the impacts of off leash dogs are not based on any scientific studies. There is no scientific evidence that off leash dog walking has had any negative effects on GGNRA lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Isabelle S Beekman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6559 **Comment Id:** 369559 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The draft plan/SEIS is fundamentally flawed because it is not supported by empirical evidence. It relies on pure conjecture in speculating that dogs "could" or "might" cause environmental or other harm to specific areas of the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Joel Yodowitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6595 **Comment Id:** 369589 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS lacks relevant scientific evidence to adequately substantiate claims of

potential impacts. Where impacts cannot be appropriately substantiated, they should be removed from the document. This particularly pertains to assertions of biological and health/safety impacts.

Organization:

Commenter: Antonia Sivyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6673 **Comment Id:** 369597 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

Organization: McLaren Park Collaborative; Friends and Advocates of Crocker Amazon & the Excelsior

Commenter: Linda S Litehiser **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6596 **Comment Id:** 369630 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The DEIS definitely needs to provide full disclosure to the public and decision makers. If dog- related disturbances are having a significant negative effect on wildlife, for example, the DEIS needs to provide site-specific scientific evidence as documentation and undertake a scientific evaluation as to whether people or other factors are also causing or contributing to the problem noted. [You could give examples where the DEIS says there are impacts in an area that you have not observed in that area or where the problem is does not seem to be caused by dog). If they are, GGNRA needs to provide an analysis that considers whether people should also be restricted from these areas. We need this documentation in order to comment meaningfully on the draft plan and DEIS. The science needs to be sound and the consequences need to be fully and fairly disclosed for everyone ' so that an informed decision can be made.

Organization:

Commenter: Timothy Sinclair **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369642 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEES, like the DEIS before it, offers no solid, site-specific evidence that dogs, and especially off-leash dogs, are causing major environmental or safety impacts. Instead, it lists impacts that dogs could, might, and can cause, while offering no evidence any are actually occurring now in the GGNRA or ever have. The SETS uses the results of the literature searches to describe impacts that could, might, or may occur in the GGNRA. But, of course, because theyve not done any site-specific studies, they cannot say that any of these impacts are actually occurring in the GGNRA now or that they ever have. As mentioned above, the literature citations in the SEIS, like those in the DEIS, are often misleading, inaccurate, or misrepresent what was

said in the cited reference. Many misleading citations were mentioned in DEIS comments, but were still repeated in the SEIS. The SEIS does contain additional references not cited in the DEIS. However, many of these are also misleading. For example, the SEIS on p. 1231 cites a 1998 Northern Virginia Planning District Commission report: For example, in the 20-square-mile Four Mile Run watershed in Northern Virginia, a dog population of 11,400 has been identified as a major contributor of [fecal coliform] bacteria in the watershed. However, a later study that used DNA analysis of the bacteria detected found that dogs actually contributed less fecal bacteria to the watershed than waterfowl and humans. Don Waye, in Bacteria Source Investigation in an Urban Watershed: DNA Sleuthing in Four Mile Run (Northern Virginia Regional Commission, December 14, 2000), found that waterfowl accounted for 37 percent of the coliform, humans 17 percent, raccoons 15 percent, deer 10 percent, and dogs 9 percent. Dogs were not a major contributor. The reference in the SETS should be removed as it was proven by the later study (not referenced in the SETS) to be wrong. Frankly, given the problems with the literature citations in the SEIS, I do not think they can be used to justify any restrictions on access for people with dogs.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369643 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE SEIS USES ANECDOTES TO PROVE IMPACTS FROM DOGS Given the lack of site-specific, peer-reviewed evidence that dogs cause impacts, the SEIS cites anecdotal reports from GGNRA staff of observed impacts. For example, on p. 375, the SETS says: In conclusion, very little peer-reviewed literature exists documenting disturbance to vegetation and soils specifically as a result of domestic dogs in recreational/park settings. However, NPS rangers have observed dogs affecting soils and vegetation at GGNRA sites. No other information is given. How many dogs? Was it 10 dogs or 10,000? What were they doing? We dont know because the SEIS doesnt say. Because it doesnt say, theres no way to know whether these observations represent a significant impact or not. Frankly, I expected a rigorous scientific analysis of impacts in the SETS, not anecdotal stories. Similarly, the SEIS includes anecdotal stories of impacts from the DEIS comments to support its claims of impacts from dogs. For example, on p. 1231, the SEIS says: Currently, adverse impacts on visitor human health and safety from dog-related pathogens exist at all park sites considered in this draft plan/SEIS. The only evidence to support this statement are anecdotes from DEIS commenters, e.g., At San Francisco General Hospital, we have seen over the years innumerable dog bites and many of these parasitic and bacterial infections transmitted by dogs. Sounds bad. But, because it is an anecdote, rather than a peer-reviewed study or official statistic, there is no way to judge the comments veracity. Yet it is presented in the SETS as proof of an impact. Theres a reason public policy is based on science not anecdotes. Because the SEIS relies so heavily on anecdotal accounts of impacts, it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369644 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE SEIS USES ANECDOTES TO PROVE IMPACTS FROM DOGS Given the lack of site-specific, peer-reviewed evidence that dogs cause impacts, the SEIS cites anecdotal reports from GGNRA staff of observed impacts. For example, on p. 375, the SETS says: In conclusion, very little peer-reviewed literature exists documenting disturbance to vegetation and soils specifically as a result of domestic dogs in recreational/park settings. However, NPS rangers have observed dogs affecting soils and vegetation at GGNRA sites. No other information is given. How many dogs? Was it 10 dogs or 10,000? What were they doing? We dont know because the SEIS doesnt say. Because it doesnt say, theres no way to know whether these observations represent a significant impact or not. Frankly, I expected a rigorous scientific analysis of impacts in the SETS, not anecdotal stories. That is why I suggested, in my DEIS public comment, that GGNRA staff had demonstrated such a bias against dog walking that they could not impartially and fairly analyze the public comments on the DEIS and therefore, I called for a independent analysis of the DEIS public comments. It is not clear in the SEIS, if that happened or not. However, if GGNRA staff are too biased to impartially and fairly evaluate public comments, they are also too biased for the SEIS to use their best professional judgment as part of an impartial and fair analysis of impacts, especially where no site-specific studies have shown an impact. Because the SEIS, in fact, does rely heavily on analysis from park staff who have demonstrated bias against dogs, it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369654 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS, like the DEIS before it, does not adequately analyze the No Action Alternative. There is little discussion of management strategies that could mitigate existing problems or tensions. There is no discussion of improved signage, or working with dog groups to resolve problems through training or other programs. SFDOG has conducted successful dog-horse socialization workshops modeled after workshops in the East Bay hills that reduced conflicts on trails between dogs and horses by over 90% (these workshops were mentioned in my DEIS comment). Crissy Field DOG has organized dog training workshops with the SF/SPCA at Crissy Field. Yet the SETS includes no mention of these and other kinds of programs that can help mitigate on-going problems. When hang gliders at Fort Funston complained about stepping in dog poop in their takeoff area, Fort Funston Dog Walkers and SFDOG produced signs, with our organizations logos prominently displayed, asking dog walkers to keep their dogs out of the takeoff area. The signs showed dog walkers peers asking them to stay out of the area, not the GGNRA demanding that they do so, and, as a result, the problem significantly improved. Yet there is no mention of this kind of cooperative approach to resolving issues. There is no acknowledgement in the SEIS that it is already illegal to let dogs chase birds or jump on people. If the GGNRA enforced those rules, rather than focusing on the mere presence or absence of a leash, conflicts could be lessened. The SEIS mentions that a dog bit a police horse at Crissy Field in 2012 (p. 1228), but does not mention that a mechanism already exists to deal with aggressive dogs, and it was used in this case. The dog was referred to the San Francisco Police Departments Vicious and Dangerous Dog Unit for a hearing. The hearing officer ordered the dog to be

euthanized, and, after a period of negotiation with the City, the owner finally surrendered ownership of the dog, who was then moved out of San Francisco in the care of a trainer for intense training. That dog will not cause any more problems at Crissy Field or anywhere else in the GGNRA. There is already a way to deal with aggressive dogs, as this case showed. Yet the only solution offered in the SEIS to any of these problems is to either ban dogs entirely or require leashes. Note that I made the same criticism in my DEIS comment, but the SETS did not respond to it.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369655 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SETS says, on p. 97: This project is unique in that adverse impacts to park resources and values are currently occurring as a result of alternative A and are therefore described as continued because they are occurring and will continue to occur without action. Yet, as has been described earlier, the SEIS says the GGNRA does not have any site-specific, peer-reviewed studies providing evidence of impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils or on wildlife. Dogs have been walked off-leash at GGNRA sites for over 40 years (at least as long as the GGNRA has been in existence). Negative impacts should be clear by now. But the GGNRA has not done the site specific studies that would prove they are actually there. They produced six years of literature searches, but did not produce any site-specific, peer-reviewed studies. Yet they say adverse impacts to park resources are now continued. An ETS must base statements like that on solid evidence, but that is lacking in this case. Therefore, the analysis of the No Action Alternative that assumes these continued impacts is flawed. In a similar vein, the SEIS says, on p. 1339: Under Alternative A, an undefined policy never promulgated as an enforceable regulation governing dog activities within certain areas of the park... The 1979 Pet Policy was not undefined. It was the result of extensive public hearings and comments. It was quite clear where dogs could walk off-leash and where they could not. Again, the SEIS paints a negative and biased picture of the No Action Alternative. The SEIS says of Alternative A on p. 1340: Additionally, the dog management policy that would continue as a result of the no-action alternative would be inconsistent with NPS regulations... The ostensible point of this whole exercise was to create a Dog Management Plan for the GGNRA that would allow some off-leash dog walking, even though dogs are not allowed off-leash (except when hunting and killing wildlife!) in other units of the National Park Service. How can this be held against the No Action Alternative? It is circular reasoning at best. Because the SEIS so inadequately and incorrectly analyzes the No Action Alternative, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6590 **Comment Id:** 369666 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Failure to Analyze the Impact of the Proposed Alternatives on Recreation As detailed in the K&L Gates comments made on behalf of CFDG, the SEIS fails to take into

account recreation as part of the environment in the GGNRA and the impact on human recreational uses from the proposed preferred alternative. The SEIS does not analyze or respond adequately to the recommendation made as Exhibit B to the original CFDG comments which are attached here as part of Exhibit A. As counsel for CFDG has pointed out in the past: Conservation of recreation is an essential GGNRA value that should not be impaired (see SDEIS inadequate discussion of impairment on pages 42- 43). Certainly conservation of GGNRAs ecological integrity is a paramount mandate under the NPS organic act, but omitting urban recreation as an objective and as a park value that should be maintained improperly biases the planning and alternatives evaluation process. Instead, the SDEIS treats GGNRA as victim of lack of recreational space in Bay Area (pages 21-22). As noted, the need for urban recreation area is one of the main reasons GGNRA was established in the first place (see GGNRA organic act quoted above and on page 43 of the SDEIS). This need for urban recreation is not an impact on GGNRA - it is one of GGNRAs fundamental purposes. This basic error permeates the SDETS. Comment of Ken Weiner to SEIS dated February 14, 2014. The SEIS bias against recreation impacts park users and the members of CFDG disproportionately. CFDG recommends that NPS perform the evaluation originally recommend in Exhibit B to CFDGs original comments.

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Commenter: Martha Walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6590 **Comment Id:** 369667 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The Lack of Site Specific Impact Data Leads to Unwarranted Assumptions In response to CFDGs original comments noting the defects in the scientific data and basis for its assumptions, NPSs response can fairly be summarized as: In lieu of site specific data, research methods generally accepted in the scientific community and best professional judgment have been used to draw conclusions regarding expected impacts to resources, consistent with CEQ and DOT requirements. The available data provides sufficient information to allow the decision maker to make a reasoned choice among alternatives. What is described as reasoned choice among alternatives does not explain the assumptions about what could or might happen in the future. These are sites where there has been active recreation for decades. While the research methods may be appropriate for the locations where the research was done, the SEIS fails to adequately take into account the different and unique circumstances of these sites. Without that detail, the leaps from other data to the conclusion that an impact could happen is insufficient to support the need for the preferred alternative. CFDG urges that there be site-specific data and analysis before the conclusions reached about what could happen are meaningful.

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Commenter: Martha Walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/28/2014)

GA2000 Impact Analysis: Use Trends And Assumptions (Substantive)

1. **Commenters questioned the levels of incidents with dogs presented in the SEIS, and the validity of this data, including data collected from visitor studies. Some commenters felt the incident levels did not warrant greater restrictions, while other commenters felt these levels were low, due to unreported incidents.**

Correspondence Id: 1489 **Comment Id:** 352902 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It sounds by all the information I have read that the studies that have been done in the past have been skewed. If you look at the number of incidents with dogs (ei dog bites) it is unbelievably few as compared to crimes (violent and otherwise) by adults in these parks. Every way you look at it, adults are more dangerous to each other than dogs every have been or will be.
Organization:
Commenter: Jane M Shapiro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2615 **Comment Id:** 356885 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Finally as an owner of a market research consultancy I have concerns about the objectivity and quality of the "visitor surveys" that were undertaken 2008 and 2011. Both the sample and the methodology appear to be flawed and therefore subject to bias.
Organization:
Commenter: Adam French **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4546 **Comment Id:** 360534 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Incident reports from 2013 show a small number of dog-related incidents within the hundreds of thousands of visits to the GGNRA, much smaller than the number of reported incidents involving people; again, data that does not support the need for such a drastic change nor the request for a staggering $2 million for more rangers.
Organization:
Commenter: Vicki B Tiernan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5227 **Comment Id:** 362713 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If there is a problem with dogs within the GGNRA, the NPS dog incident data should contain a record of the issues. Between 2001 and 2011, the GGNRA recorded 4,932 dog-related incidents, or 448/year or less than two per day across all 80,000 acres and 24 dog sites in

the GGNRA. The GGNRA sees over 13,000,000 visitors per year and yet only records 448 incidents per year. This is hardly indicative of a problem, and in fact proves that the 1979 Pet Policy works.

Organization:

Commenter: David Nielsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363171 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is apparent that the vast majority of violations of rules are never reported by visitors or observed by park staff. Naturally, many non-compliant owners change their illegal behaviors quickly upon noticing the presence of park staff. Due to the size of the parks compared to the parks small number of staff a visitor can hike for many hours, even days, without ever coming in contact with park staff. Therefore the incidents in this report should be considered as a small percentage of the overall violations that do occur within a year at the parks. The non-compliant dog owners listed in the majority (>90%) ncidents in the 2009 Criminal Incident record are given a verbal or written warning. The reports indicate that their names are entered into a database and they will be cited for subsequent infractions.

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6178 **Comment Id:** 365757 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I carefully read the section of the report from pages 252-258, which describes many of the reported dog-related incidents. Over a 10-year period, there are reports of about 4000 events, which averages to 400/year or about 30 each month - roughly one each day. This sounds terrible, but there is no data offered for comparison. What is the incidence of dog-related incidents in a comparably-sized park with comparable volume of visitors, and dogs either not allowed or only allowed on leash? Is it much lower, the same, or much higher? Without any comparative analysis, this data is absolutely meaningless, and is not useful as a basis for a massive change in policy. If the NPS wants to impose a policy change on the GGNRA, and wants to offer data to support this change, the NPS should offer enough data to show that the policy change will have the intended effect. This data does not indicate anything useful about the proposed policy change.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters were concerned that the NPS did not adequately analyze where dog walkers would go in surrounding areas if the preferred alternative were selected. Some commenters stated that this analysis was requested by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.**

Correspondence Id: 1250 **Comment Id:** 352069 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Have you done an impact analysis on where all the dogs will go if your proposed plan is in place? This could cause over concentration of dog use in dog parks and neighborhood/city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Dana N Tuttle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1261 **Comment Id:** 352191 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And certainly insufficient study has been done to show the impact to lands from the displacement. These lands could include GGNRA lands were dogs are not being taken (legally or not), other state parks in the area, and of course city parks, which will then be the only remaining legal dog areas that will not be able to cope with increased load.

Organization:

Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1315 **Comment Id:** 352295 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption

Organization:

Commenter: mary nelson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2873 **Comment Id:** 357704 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Any reduction to on or off-leash dog areas will require dog parents to travel greater distances, convening on fewer spots making the related traffic and parking more congested. Have these impacts been estimated, quantified, evaluated, considered, peer reviewed and publicly disclosed? If so, where is that analysis?

Organization: SaveOffLeash.com

Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3919 **Comment Id:** 360011 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded,

there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.
Organization:
Commenter: Amanda Burke **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 1070 **Comment Id:** 351524 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I was not able to find a definition of "dog incidents" in the documentation, and would be curious to know what level of severity is represented by this categorization. Nevertheless, the overall levels did not seem at all high relative to the usage of park lands by dog owners. Ocean Beach, with its high overall levels of incidents, is probably the least 'noisy' data, and that shows dog incidents being below 15% o the total on a consistent basis. Crissy Field for the last 2 years of data have also been below 15%. hout knowing the proportional use of the lands by dog owners it is difficult to know with certainty how this compares, but considering the fact that well above 15% o households own dogs it would seem that this data does not support increasing restrictions on dog usage in a broad-based fashion.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Manning **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 174 **Comment Id:** 349983 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I think it'd be extremely helpful and necessary for you to include with the number of incidents reported how many canine and human visitors you have to the park throughout the study period. While I can understand that even one incident is one too many this must be analyzed on a percentage basis. 75 incidents out of say 100,000 visitors is not significant and just reporting 75 is misleading and fraudulent.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1189 **Comment Id:** 351951 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, District 4 contains only two off-leash dog play areas managed by the Recreation and Park Department in its boundaries, both of which are located in Stern Grove, over one mile away from Ocean Beach. Without an adequate analysis of how closing 80% of Ocean Beach to dogs would impact our City dog play areas and the maintenance load of our City departments, we cannot support the Preferred Alternative.

Organization: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Commenter: Eric and Katy Mar and Tang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1287 **Comment Id:** 352245 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption

Organization:

Commenter: Natalie Tondelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1300 **Comment Id:** 352263 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.
Organization:
Commenter: Jeff Osteen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1378 **Comment Id:** 352417 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There have been so few "dog-related" incidences that it is such a shame to implement further restrictions for those of us are responsible and enjoy walking our dogs off-leash. Not only is it an important freedom for dogs, but also for ourselves.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1378 **Comment Id:** 352418 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Have there been enough dog-related incidences to warrant this restrictive law? If statistics were examined, I'm confident the response would be "no".
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1436 **Comment Id:** 352550 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In reality, given the enormous number of dog walkers that allow their dogs to exercise and play off leash, any such incidents are truly rare.
Organization:
Commenter: Mark H **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1523 **Comment Id:** 352996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there

and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Len Carella **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1735 **Comment Id:** 353537 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Stacey Dirzuweit **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1796 **Comment Id:** 353933 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheryl R Owyang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4192 **Comment Id:** 355965 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: To make such dramatic changes without sound science and evaluating the impact of those changes, specifically what it will do to our City parks, is unconscionable.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4473 **Comment Id:** 356011 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred A.lter.native. This analysis was requested by public com ment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Theresa Gaydon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2635 **Comment Id:** 356942 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA has spent millions of our tax dollars compiling a 2,400-page report full of anecdotal evidence and skewed scientific reporting telling us what dogs "could" and "might" do, but have failed to include what impacts closing down these areas would have on surrounding neighborhoods. The fact is, if the dog plan gets approved, local parks and trails would be overwhelmed with dog walkers kicked off their favorite trails.
Organization:
Commenter: Betsy DeFries **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357065 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There is inadequate factual basis in the current plan for the proposed changes. The GGNRA claims it is responding to what it said were rising complaints from park visitors and park officers, yet it has failed to provide current data to back up that claim. We walk our dog in these areas and have rarely seen any altercations other than minor (and natural) dog-on-dog interactions
Organization:
Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357066 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. The public and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors requested this analysis in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, albeit much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The GGNRA has not adequately studied the dispersion effect of its plan on local communities, neighborhoods and residential areas. These include parking, traffic congestion, driving patterns and increased miles traveled to reach dog-friendly areas
Organization:
Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357575 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their

dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3343 **Comment Id:** 358194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Ian Gover **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3566 **Comment Id:** 359242 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephanie S Palmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3787 **Comment Id:** 359775 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Table 9 "Summary of Visitor use" is a joke! A fabrication with no provided supporting evidence. Most of the "data" in it is based on is subjective and collected by observers with an observational bias. This is the worse, most bias piece of so-called science I have ever seen. It is pointless even discussing the details because it is all so far off base. I challenge any UNBIASED observer to station themselves at any of these areas and conclude the the dog use is "low" or "low to moderate". NO WAY! Low to Moderate at Rancho Corral de Tierra??? Who are you trying to fool? Practically everyone there has one or two dogs!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3869 **Comment Id:** 359999 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The

GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

Organization:

Commenter: David Levin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3958 **Comment Id:** 360183 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the GGNRA's Dog Management for a number of reason: 1. I believe that it is too restrictive and that having limited off leash areas will create more problems in the designated areas and surrounding areas too- no research has been done to find out the impacts this will have on other areas

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Tausend **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4788 **Comment Id:** 361533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. The need for open space areas for dogs is important not only for the health of the dog, but to maintain adequate space between dogs. Limiting this open space will therefore result in overcrowding of dogs in the dog parks - leading to unfortunate situations of more aggression and a less relaxed atmosphere.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Kattula **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361913 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If the claim of dogs compromising visitor safety were true, then there proposal should reflect such impact. In other words, why would they allow dogs to be in the areas of Ocean Beach that are more highly populated with humans. If this claim were justified then they should allow dogs to be where most humans are not. Yet their proposal restricts the areas of Ocean Beach to the areas where there is easy access, parking lots and known use by the majority of those that visit the beach. Why place the highest population of people in close proximity to the one thing they claim is compromising their safety?

Organization:

Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5004 **Comment Id:** 361925 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The vast majority of respondents prefer off leash rules: 550 v. 191. The vast majority oppose the management plan: 1279 v. 343. The vast majority of visitors enjoy dogs: 301 v. 153.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Quinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362633 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The 2013 SEIS also disregards and does not consider a single impact to the surrounding communities that are adjacent the GGNRA. Nor does it consider the severe impacts to the actual users of the GGNRA whove relied upon and cherished these lands since their inception as a park.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5270 **Comment Id:** 362847 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In general, characterization of dog-related issues in the SEIS is misleading. The SEIS document has failed to provide evidence that dog walking is resulting in conflicts and resource degradation. From 2008 through 2011, a total of 1,537 dog-related incidents associated with natural resources occurred at GGNRA according to Table 6 in the SEIS. However, out of a total of 1,537 dog-related incidents, there were only three incidents of dogs destroying vegetation. Meanwhile, there were only 15 dog-related incidents of dogs disturbing wildlife. 1,519 incidents were related to dogs being off-leash in on-leash areas or dogs being in closed areas-incidents that could be attributed to lack of public education and signage by GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine C Cowdery **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362858 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS cites violations as proof of impacts, but violations are given for wildlife disturbance whether or not it was observed. I was once given a violation for disturbing wildlife for simply having my dog off leash while playing ball in the surf, and no wildlife disturbance had occurred. This violations data cannot be a proxy for actual observed wildlife disturbance - it is not sound science.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5294 **Comment Id:** 362911 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

Organization:

Commenter: Anna Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5308 **Comment Id:** 362946 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: You ignore credible science in favor of junk science because it suits your end goal. You mis-state statistics on purpose. At a recent town hall meeting in Stern Grove you made the statement that dogs are at the top of your list of reported incidents. This is not true. Ive seen the data.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean Kind **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5312 **Comment Id:** 362951 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The majority of park users surveyed were in support of off leash dog walking. "approximately 22 percent of all respondents who had visited the park and had seen an off-leash dog reported that off-leash dogs detracted from their visitation experience. Twenty-seven percent said that seeing an off-leash dog added to their visitation experience and 49 percent stated that off-leash dogs did not affect their experience" and when I looked at the compilations of incident reports relating to off leash dog walking I was startled to find how few incidents there were of environmental damage or park user conflict. I'm fact the overwhelming majority of incidents involved violations of the off leash laws.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim W Stockinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5469 **Comment Id:** 363326 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption

Organization:

Commenter: Julie Samuels **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5472 **Comment Id:** 363333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan also does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby city parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. But no evidence is given to support either assumption. And if people do move to the city parks, they will be overwhelmed with dogs and their owners, making it an unpleasant and unsafe environment for all city dwellers.

Organization:

Commenter: Kalyn L Chomko **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5847 **Comment Id:** 364395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura I Ducoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364479 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The most recent data (2012-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been very few negative incidents involving dogs as compared to the many more reported negative incidents involving people. This data therefore does not support the request or the need for a change as proposed in the draft dog management plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5889 **Comment Id:** 364521 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In terms of the incidents that sometimes occur, the sparse documentation provided vis-ï¿½-vis the incidents reports in the document imply less than one dog-related incident per 20,000 to 30,000 visits. Not bad. People dont behave that well in shopping malls. As to the environmental issues, the case for any serious consequences has not been made.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6200 **Comment Id:** 366000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For the years from 2008 to 2011, in most cases, there has been a steady and significant downward trend in the number of these incidents. For example, at Crissy Field, the number of incidents falls from almost 200 to much less than 100, including a dramatic reduction in the incidents of dogs in the WPA. These reductions have come about because of increased efforts at education, as well as self-policing of these areas. On the basis of this data, I believe the present policy is working, and that some additional investment in education would produce significant benefits. In contrast, the report gives no evidence to show that the proposed policy changes will have beneficial effects, or that the presence of the proposed policies in other comparable urban park settings has had these benefits.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367536 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A fact to consider: in the year 2012 to 2013, (data I received from a GGNRA staffer) out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs; there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. While I am troubled that these dog-related incidents occurred and want to prevent any type of further dog incidents, I believe that expanding the San Francisco SPCAs Off Leash Open Space dog-training class would help to reduce such dog related incidents in the future. Also, it is my understanding the human incidents rate in the GGNRA for the same time period is much, much higher. This data does not support a need for change to further restrict off leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368101 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is inadequate factual basis in the current plan for the proposed changes. The GGNRA claims it is responding to what it said were rising complaints from park visitors and park officers, yet it has failed to provide current data to back up that claim. We walk our dog in these areas and have rarely seen any altercations other than minor (and natural) dog-on-dog interactions.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6656 **Comment Id:** 368250 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the information from the GGNRA, the only data I was able to find showed that in the last year with hundreds of thousands of visits by people and dogs, only 6 dog bites were reported. The data also specified 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people

were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite. These exceedingly low numbers hardly call for a drastic change in the 1979 Pet Policy.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan M Kaplan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368266 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The EIS/SEIS both failed to establish the number of visitors to Fort Funston. As a result of the failure to establish the number of visitors per year to Fort Funston, the reports of problems with dogs (or people) cannot be evaluated. Per the SEIS, the GGNRA has between 13 million and 15 million visitors per year, yet the overall "dog related" incidents for the years 2008 through 2011 were only 2,775. 2,775 incidents versus a minimum of 52 million visitors (13 million multiplied by 4 years) is statistically insignificant. While I am sure the NPS knows the approximate number of yearly visitors to Fort Funston, it has conveniently chosen not to include this very important information in the SEIS which prevents an accurate discussion of the impact of dog walking at Fort Funston. The 172 "dog related" incidents between 2008-2011 at Fort Funston have not been evaluated in relationship to the number of visitors to Fort Funston between 2008-2011. Therefore, the conclusion on page 221 that there are a high number of dog related incidents and conflicts affecting Human Safety has not been established.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368269 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: 2012 NPS Dog Walking Survey - While I did respond to the survey, the survey was poorly constructed as it was set-up only to support the previous conclusions of the NPS.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369141 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Second, the number of park visitors has NOT increased dramatically over the past 20 years. In fact, in 1987 the GGNRA experienced its greatest number of visitors, coming in at 21,767,176 recreational visitors. According to NPS statistics, in 2010, the total number of recreational visitors was 14,271,503, down about 34% from 1988. The SEIS attempts to attribute the decrease in visitors to a change in statistical methods, eliminating the visitors to the San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park from the GGNRA count. However, the SEIS ultimately concludes annual visitation to the GGNRA is shown to have reached a capacity of 13 to 15 million visitors as the following graph shows. (The graph was a part of our DEIS Comment). Consider also that in the past 20 years the GGNRA acreage has almost doubled in size, and expanded into San Mateo County. This puts a far larger population in direct proximity to the Recreation Area, yet the visitor numbers are down dramatically.

Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

GA3000 Impact Analysis: General Methodology For Establishing Impacts/Effects (Substantive)

1. **Commenters felt the impacts analysis lacked site-specific and peer-reviewed studies that had a scientific basis. Some commenters noted that as a result, the restrictions proposed in the DMP were not justified.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1011 **Comment Id:** 351428 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the "best professional judgment of NPS staff" to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for "proof" that impacts from dogs are currently occurring

Organization:

Commenter: David Nale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1275 **Comment Id:** 352221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Your GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation, the Memorandum of Understanding with SF for this park property, and NPS Rules, Regulations and Policy because they have failed to perform "vital monitoring" which NPS considers an essential element of sound principles of land use, planning and management. GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources due to the presence of dogs nor their guardians, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes. Federal law requires site-specific, peer reviewed studies to justify and guide changes in management of National Park System resources.The SEIS acknowledges the GGNRA has no such site-specific, peer reviewed studies for the impact of dogs and their guardians on water quality, vegetation, soils and wildlife in the GGNRA.

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston

Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1414 **Comment Id:** 352512 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Maya A De La Rosa-Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4944 **Comment Id:** 361804 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have read the report carefully, and I have not found any evidence in the report that shows the planned change in policy will reduce the number of dog bites. Does the park service have any statistical data reporting the incidence of dog bites for the two scenarios being compared (present rules or revised rules)? Without such data, I don't believe that there is a reasonable basis for expecting the proposed policy change to reduce the incidence of dog bites.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5270 **Comment Id:** 362846 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, the SEIS fails to link off-leash and on-leash dog walking with documented resource impacts. GGNRAs SEIS has failed to provide actual scientific data about dog walkings impact on natural resources in Rancho, such as wildlife and vegetation. Not only does GGNRA not have any peer-reviewed scientific data about resource impacts, all of the resource impact statements in the SEIS are purely speculative. Off-leash and on-leash dog walking has occurred in Rancho Corral de Tierra for decades, including during the past two years while it has been under the management of GGNRA (as acknowledged in the SEIS). Despite this history, Rancho continues to provide valuable habitat for wildlife.

Organization:

Commenter: Christine C Cowdery **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6101 **Comment Id:** 365416 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: After almost three years and two draft plans comprising a combined 4,300 pages ,where is the scientific study conducted at Fort Funston or any other recreational unit in the GGNRA? There are few, if any, scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so the plan cites anecdotal observations of impacts made by National Park Service Staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An EIS is expected to be based on science, not anecdote.

Organization:

Commenter: Dave Emanuel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368106 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports the proposed drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. Dogs and their walkers are not going off trail so how many dogs are in fact leaving these trails and invading critical wildlife habitat? The GGNRA should take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis, provide the data and stop speaking hypothetically. We would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site specific peer-reviewed studies before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters questioned the scientific rigor of the studies cited in the impacts analysis of the SEIS, including the visitor use surveys, incident data, and studies cited in the document.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1276 **Comment Id:** 352230 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The report used to justify that Dog's disturb plovers was done on one afternoon, and was merely one guy observing. There was no "study" done. That's just one example of the many falsities perpetuated in this whole situation.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah Carsey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357579 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS cites several surveys of visitor use and visitor satisfaction, including two done in 2011 in response to DEIS comments, that were so poorly done that their results are essentially meaningless. A 2008 visitor use survey at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field used people who intercepted people at these sites and asked about their park usage. However, the interceptors were observed by several people to actively avoid talking to people walking with dogs,

hopelessly skewing their results. A 2011 visitor use survey at Fort Funston and Muir Beach, done specifically in response to DEIS comments, only counted people as walking dogs if they had a leash in their hand. People walking with a friend and the friends dog were not counted as a dog walker (because they did not have a dog of their own with them), even though they were only walking there to walk with the friends dog. A 2011 Visitor Satisfaction Survey was so confusing respondents didnt know if they were being asked about their satisfaction with current conditions at GGNRA sites or with the severe restrictions proposed in the DEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4872 **Comment Id:** 361663 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: At Crissy Field, the use of monthly vehicle counts to estimate park use is even more inherently erroneous since a large number of visitors are tourists either walking or on bicycles and do not drive to the park. In addition, the methodology that is essentially one dog per one person is in error because the majority of people who frequent parks tend to do so in groups; therefore, the estimation of visitor use for dog play/exercise is at best inaccurate. Based on the inherent flaws in the underlying data calculating park visitation, it is unclear how any conclusions can be made as to the advantages/disadvantages of any of the alternatives developed. It is recommended that visitor surveys be conducted at least quarterly on two weekdays and two weekend days and that count estimates are modified to include the total number of people who use the GGNRA (i.e., total number surfing, total number dog walking, etc), and specifically at Crissy Field, to differentiate between promenade and beach use; these data will allow the NPS to obtain a more realistic understanding of park use.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynne Srinivasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5227 **Comment Id:** 362707 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The NPS cites a very general survey of public opinion on restricting dogs at the GGNRA conducted in 2002 by Northern Arizona University as support for its Plan. In the survey, 53% o respondents stated that they opposed allowing off-leash walking in GGNRA sites, while 40% wre in favor. The survey is too general to be of use. The GGNRA spans 117 square miles and contains 24 defined sites with dog walking / off-leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: David Nielsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368418 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Data from Beach Watch surveys (Beach Watch 2006; 2009) is used in the SEIS. Although the data from this survey may be appropriate to use to mention the presence and general abundance of certain species of shorebirds, there are severe limitations to this data. This

data is based on encounter rates as were the Snowy Plover surveys done by GGNRA, so the data on shorebirds cannot be considered as an accurate survey of shorebird populations. The surveys were done every two weeks and may not have been conducted during peak migration periods and may have completely missed the presence of some bird species during migration and the peak number of individuals of various species during migration. Although some aspects of the data may be useful, I do not think it should be used to draw conclusions about the relative species numbers or the habitat importance between different sites

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369402 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The study by Zlatunich-Lynes exhibits many of the scientific shortcomings noted in previous studies: -This study was merely an observational study -The observational collection of data was performed by Audubon volunteers who had a bias-the GGAS has publicly advocated the banning of dogs to protect the plover -This study made no attempt to ascertain comparative effects on the plover. There is no discussion of the disturbance level perpetrated by other sources, even though they tell us that data was collected -Raw data is not provided to the reader -The analysis appears to be biased because it is based upon incomplete data. For example, the level of disturbance is not categorized in the analysis even though we are told they were categorized in their collection. -Assumptions are made in this analysis without supporting explanation. For example, they decided to assign the disturbance to an on-leash dog if he was closer to the plover than his guardian. This ignores the possibility the disturbance was due to the number of bodies- -e.g. two people walking would disturb a plover to the same extent as a leashed dog and a person.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Commenters did not agree with the analysis that resulted in impact levels. Many commenters suggested alternative impact levels for alternatives that should be considered based on the impacts analysis. Commenters suggested decisions for alternatives were not based on resource protection, and did not consider all resources.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1415 **Comment Id:** 352514 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Therefore to be more truthful, I suggest you take into consideration that even in areas where no dogs are allowed, there will be impacts from dog walking. Some dog walkers prefer to get away from other people and dogs and will seek out "no dogs allowed" areas to do so. I once had a friend tell me she purposely walked her dog on a "no dog" trail because her dog didn't get along with other dogs. Assuming "no impacts" from dogs in areas where no dogs are allowed is dependent upon enforcement until such time as people decide they need to obey the rules. Having lived next door to a 35 acre offleash dog park for nearly 20 years and following the

progression of offleash dog recreation in CA, I suggest modifying any statement as to "no impacts" in areas where "no dogs" are allowed by adding it will take "consistent enforcement" for that to be a truer statement of fact.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357935 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS compared on-leash impact with non-compliance in the SPPA to no dogs assuming compliance; however, the SEIS did not provide any justification for the assumption that enforcement of a no-dog policy in the SPPA would have any better rate of compliance. The GGNRA would need to compare a no-dog policy with non-compliance to an on-leash dog policy with non-compliance in order to justify any claim of a beneficial impact. If the GGNRA intends to enforce a no-dog policy in the SPPA then it would need to compare a no-dog policy with enforcement and compliance to an on-leash dog policy with enforcement and compliance.

Organization:

Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365551 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Significance of Impacts Not Adequately Assessed The DSEIS evaluates the significance of impacts in comparison with and consideration of beneficial activities that are being conducted in the GGNRA and even outside of GGNRA. The impacts of dogs are weighted and evaluated with activities being conducted by GGNRA, the Park Conservancy and others, including wetland and other habitat restoration and enhancement projects and management actions such as controlled burns. Offsite restoration projects and projects implemented by others than the federal government are also cited. This is a slippery slope. These restorations/enhancements are not being implemented to mitigate for or justify dog impacts. Furthermore, most or none of the restorations would not in any way offset impacts from dog use. The argument can be made that restoring habitats would actually increase impacts because the habitat areas that dogs could disturb would be increased. Also most or all of those restoration/management activities within the park would be done anyway because it is GGNRA's responsibility to protect, enhance and restore habitat for endangered species. Finally, the NPS must consider the consequences of claiming unrelated restoration activities as mitigation to offset or balance impacts of their project. What if shopping center or housing project developers were to claim their impacts are negligible because restoration projects of GGNRA and others created offsetting beneficial conditions? This is a real and potentially disastrous outcome, if perhaps unintended, of the approach taken in this document. MAS certainly doesn't want habitat restoration projects we have implemented to be used to offset damage to other habitats The only effective mitigations for dog impacts are suitable protective restrictions and an education and enforcement program that works.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6140 **Comment Id:** 365598 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On page 93-94, the report discusses the various ROLAs that have been eliminated from consideration in any of the recommended alternatives. In each case, the decision is stated, with one or two accompanying reasons, but without any discussion of the reasons for preserving these ROLAs, or analysis of the benefits -vs- detriments of these decisions. I think it is obvious that elimination of off-leash dogs from all of these areas may have one or more minor beneficial effects, but I also believe that there will be significant impact to the opportunities for public enjoyment of these spaces. The report does not even pretend to offer a balanced analysis of the benefits and impacts of these decisions.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA makes the assumption that there needs to be a no dog experience at all of the 22 areas under consideration for dog walking access. Where and how did the GGNRA make a unilateral rule that mandates such an action?
Organization:
Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368399 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The following critical areas of knowledge for dog management seemed to be virtually non-existent in GGNRA records previously reviewed: -Risk assessment of off-leash dog activity for visitor safety and experience. -Research of the issues involved in dogs impacting the quality of visitor experience: why are people bothered by off leash dogs and what can be done to mitigate or eliminate the problem? -Development of professional management techniques for reducing the impact of off-leash dogs on natural resources, visitor safety, and the quality of visitor experience. GGNRA relied on such tools as"voice control" and "visitor education" to improve compliance with dog management regulations. Such tools have proven to be ineffective over the years. GGNRA apparently had no information to suggest such tools would be effective yet relied on them in management documents. GGNRA seemed to make to no effort to understand why leash law compliance was poor and seemed to take no steps to improve compliance. -Analysis of dog-related incident data to understand how and why dog-related incidents occur and to incorporate such knowledge into Park management.
Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369444 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Additionally, in the DEIS/SEIS, the NPS designates areas as "potential habitat". The NPS treats "potential habitat" (build it and they will come) as if it were "critical habitat" and embraces all legal restrictions that would enure from that status. An example of this would be at Mori Point in Pacifica. At Mori Point the GGNRA chose to remove 2/3 of the property from recreational access in order to create potential habitat for the red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake. The GGNRA treats this "potential" habitat as if it were "critical" habitat (which it is not) with respect to recreational restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. Commenters felt that the results and conclusions of scientific studies used in the impacts analysis were misrepresented or outdated. Commenters suggested additional studies to be included, as well as studies that should not be used.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357468 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The claims regarding bird habitat & nesting (Snowy Plover, Bank Swallow, etc.) are inaccurate and have been repeatedly disputed. They are not based on scientific observation. Similarly, the impact of dogs on plant life has been exaggerated and not substantiated by any standard or scientific means.

Organization: Dog City Tours

Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357938 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Since the GGNRA has information on dog and snowy plover patterns in the SPPA, the SEIS should present and address this information rather than relying studies that are not as temporally or spatially relevant. Further, it seems there should be information more current than 2008 but this is not in the references nor mentioned in the text. In my opinion as a scientist, the information presented in the SEIS did not represent an objective review of the information that the GGNRA has available to it. My review of the information that is available from the GGNRA suggests that on- and off-leash dogs can and do disturb snowy plovers in other areas but this is generally not occurring in the SPPA at Ocean Beach. This appears to be the case regardless of whether the dogs are on- or off-leash, primarily due to the spatial separation of where dogs walk/run and where the snowy plovers roost. In the SPPA, data indicate that the level of disturbance by off-leash dogs is similar to that of disturbance by humans, suggesting that a dog ban is no more justifiable than a human ban (although a policy on the control of Corvids may be worth studying).

Organization:

Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5151 **Comment Id:** 362283 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS fails to adequately state the impact of off leash dogs on wildlife. There have been many incidences in the GGNRA of wildlife killed by dogs. Countless studies, at least one by the GGNRA itself, have documented the adverse effects off leash dogs have on wildlife.I myself have never been to Ocean Beach without witnessing the harassment of shorebirds by a series of dogs. Yet these impacts on natural resources is given too scant attention in the SEIS and not enough weight put on preventing stress to wildlife.

Organization: International Urban Estuary Network/Save the Bay

Commenter: Arlene Gemmill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362857 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Page 920 states that chronic disturbance of snowy plover at Ocean Beach during the nonbreeding season could indirectly affect breeding behavior of the species. Therefore, impacts would result in measurable and/or consequential changes in individuals of a species through frequent disturbance". The SEIS does not define "chronic disturbance" and the data does not reflect recent increases in plover populations. The old data from the 1990's should be discarded. The newer data does not provide an example of anything that could be termed "chronic disturbance". The SEIS should define chronic disturbance for Ocean Beach plover and utilize recent data to defend the conclusion that it is occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5604 **Comment Id:** 363992 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA relies on outdated studies and information for the latest supplemental environmental impact statement. Further the GGNRA has not updated its enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. This makes the conclusions and preferred alternative unfair and flawed as it is not fact based.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6157 **Comment Id:** 365661 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On page 100 of the report, the authors state that "NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment... " and proceeds to list all of the negative things that can go wrong when people interact with dogs in open spaces. However, there is no quantitative analysis of these incidents or comparisons to the likelihood of such incidents under different policies. The fact that there are some complaints is not compelling - there will be complaints under any of the proposed alternatives. Since the report makes no effort to provide a quantitative analysis of the complaints, it is unreasonable to use some complaints as

justification for a policy change, and ignore complaints that will still arise under that proposal.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368426 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS presents data on dog-related incidents but does not provide a discussion of the limitations of the data and the context needed to understand and interpret data. The raw data is presented in a way that might lead one to draw conclusions about the total number of dog-related violations per year in GGNRA or to compare the number of dog walking violations and hazards between specific areas of the Park. Without information on the effort on the part of law enforcement involved in patrolling each area and the normal behavior of off-leash dog walkers, the data is just a random collection of numbers that show nothing beyond the existence of certain types of violations by dog owners in the Park. In fact, the data represents such a small sliver of the actual violations occurring that without further data it is impossible to even estimate the number and type of violations actually occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369345 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our second example is a study, "Predicting the population consequences of human disturbance for Ringed Plovers Charadrius hiaticula: a game theory approach" by Durwyn Liley and William J. Sutherland. This study originates from the School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, Norfolk NR4 7TJ, UK. This study clarifies the following three pertinent facts: " Sites that are highly disturbed are not used by breeding birds, and therefore any increase in disturbance levels on these sites will not alter population size " No published study of a breeding bird quantifies the population consequences of disturbance. This is despite the fact that disturbance has been implied as a factor causing population decline for a wide range of species. " We think of individuals [birds] as deciding not to breed rather than being prevented from doing so. Such individuals 'queue' for good quality territories rather than adopting a poor quality territory (such as Ocean Beach).

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. Commenters felt that data provided for the impact analysis in the SEIS was well cited and scientifically-based.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5026 **Comment Id:** 362103 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Chapter 3 includes updated law enforcement, visitor use and experience, health and safety impact data. Importantly, it cites authoritative, additional peer-reviewed studies on

resource impacts. This science-based data shows the importance of ensuring the availability and health of the GGNRA for the long term. These changes reinforce the future orientation of the Park Services 2011 Draft SEIS as it addresses and balances the needs of people, pets and wildlife for the future.

Organization:

Commenter: Aria Yow, MA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5026 **Comment Id:** 362104 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Chapter 4 elaborates on these meaningful updates, and includes expanded analysis of park operations budget data. Crucially, Chapter 4 addresses operational issues such as additional fencing and financial impacts. Taken together, these additions provide robust support for both the feasibility and the benefits of implementing the SEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Aria Yow, MA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

6. Commenters suggested that the studies and the SEIS undergo a more rigorous peer review process to determine if the impacts presented were based on sound science.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362856 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I feel strongly, as a working environmental scientist for the Federal government, that the conclusions in this document are not science based and the SEIS should undergo peer review per the policy of the NPS (Interim Guidance Document Governing Code of Conduct, Peer Review, and Information Quality Correction for National Park Service Cultural and Natural Resource Disciplines, 2008). This document is essentially a programmatic EIS as there is insufficient information and analysis for each site to adequately inform science-based decision-making for such a large geographic area. The NPS should treat this document as a Programmatic EIS and tier off site-specific NEPA documents from it.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6686 **Comment Id:** 369061 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: this comment contains review of "studies" proffered by the GGNRA to substantiate restrictions designed to protect the Western snowy plover. These "studies" fail to adhere to the Code of Scientific and Scholarly conduct with respect to all three provisions listed above. We should point out that upon receiving these allegations in written form by way of our Comment on the DEIS, the NPS did not modify their planned restrictions but did remove the studies from the SEIS. Compliance with the law would have required withdrawal of the entire DMP.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6686 **Comment Id:** 369063 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We would point out that a good case can be made that the Code of Scientific and Scholarly Conduct and Federal Policy on Research Misconduct have been violated repeatedly by GGNRA personnel since the 2005 reinstatement of the 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy. Evidence of the misconduct has been submitted by OBDOG by way of public comment when "studies" were revealed to support closures. It is unconscionable that GGNRA/ NPS/DOI personnel who reviewed comments prior to these closures never made any attempt to rectify the shortcomings, and apparently condoned them. Certainly, comments regarding the 2006 Daphne Hatch "study" out at Ocean Beach confirmed scientific and research misconduct based upon Federal policy guidelines. The GGNRA/ NPS/DOI ignored the scientific policy violations, and actually implemented the closure this discredited "study" was submitted to support! Clearly, there is no scientific accountability within the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI and, in fact, scientific misconduct is authorized and supported by management all the way up to the highest levels of the Department of the Interior.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 243 **Comment Id:** 350336 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I find your lengthy document (The environmental impact statement downloaded from this website, that among other policies, bans dogs from the majority of Ocean beach in San Francisco) to be short of any scientific basis and long on opinion and politics. This is not be said that in an urban environment such as Ocean Beach in the GGNRA that politics and opinion should not have a significant role in land management. Indeed they should!

Organization: NSTA

Commenter: Fred A Andrews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1000 **Comment Id:** 351013 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

Organization: tax paying citizen

Commenter: Sven Hemmert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1001 **Comment Id:** 351019 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: You have no site-specific, peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate the claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Melanie Barti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 821 **Comment Id:** 351404 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Travis N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1012 **Comment Id:** 351431 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008

to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they werent supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Lawrence Skaggs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1048 **Comment Id:** 351482 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Organization:

Commenter: Colleen Russell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1066 **Comment Id:** 351516 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose broad restrictions on park use based only upon speculation of what might or could happen and anecdotal accounts that feed only a certain point of view. Before broad dog use restrictions are implemented I urge serious, fact-based study, recognition and acknowledgement of the active use of GGNRA park areas by the multi-generational dog walking community, not only opinions from the organized groups, but those countless numbers of us who are regular users who appreciate the out of doors with our canine companions.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen Hurley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1089 **Comment Id:** 351542 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of OUR public lands!

Organization:

Commenter: Mark Polite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1092 **Comment Id:** 351555 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer reviewed, site specific or monitoring as required by law to initiate such a drastic change to the use of our public lands. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not properly address the concerns voiced in 2011 & those comments ran 3 to 1 against the plan.

Organization:
Commenter: Mari Walsh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1120 **Comment Id:** 351670 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or viatl monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands".
Organization:
Commenter: Tiffany A Turley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1142 **Comment Id:** 351704 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: You havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support dramatic restrictions of the remaining 1% tat are being proposed.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Kline **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1213 **Comment Id:** 352001 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am writing to let you know that I strongly oppose the dog management plan. I'm not sure why you feel the need to fix something that isn't broken. This has been a much loved off leash area since the 70's. From reading the DEIS I do not see any solid proof of the claims against dogs destroying the land and killing birds.
Organization:
Commenter: Shannon Carlin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1241 **Comment Id:** 352050 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.
Organization:
Commenter: Sheri P Benjamin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1255 **Comment Id:** 352179 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the critisms and concerns expressed in 2011 comments; we support NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE, the SEIS contains no perr-reviewed, site specific studies or monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to inititiate such a dramatic change to the public's use to public land. We want the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy to be retained

Organization:
Commenter: Diane Rice **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1276 **Comment Id:** 352229 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.
Organization:
Commenter: Deborah Carsey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1280 **Comment Id:** 352236 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.
Organization:
Commenter: Tom Smalara **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1285 **Comment Id:** 352242 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: However, the primary reason I oppose the "Preferred Alternative" is that the plan that justifies the changes, the Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, is biased, unscientific, and seems to have been crafted to justify the personal preferences and biases of whoever wrote the plan, and not on any scientific reasons or even mass public sentiment. The many problems that the plan says "could" or "might" arise from off-leash dogs are simply conjecture; trumped up fearmongering invented to support the personal preferences of the writers of the plan.
Organization:
Commenter: James D Raymond **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1287 **Comment Id:** 352247 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.
Organization:
Commenter: Natalie Tondelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1300 **Comment Id:** 352264 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Osteen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1300 **Comment Id:** 352265 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Osteen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1310 **Comment Id:** 352282 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It seems that the decisions are not based on any scientific data and lean heavily on assumptions and assertions that provide little firm evidence that support them. It also appears to lack any peer reviewed site specific studies that I would think would be required before taking such action. Without studies and more formal review process, there do not seem to be any legitimate or legal foundations for these policy changes. Also, the plan does not differentiate between the impact caused by human beings or other animals and assumes that all negative impact is caused by dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Maile McComb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1311 **Comment Id:** 352289 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Organization:

Commenter: Chandra Asken **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1312 **Comment Id:** 352291 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.
Organization: cep
Commenter: Dzung Do **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1321 **Comment Id:** 352305 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. Without question more serious degradation is imposed on trails throughout the Bay Area by bikers every day, not to mention the egregious lack of courtesy for other users of trails and outdoor space. Could we consider putting them on leashes??
Organization:
Commenter: Christine Stuart **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1328 **Comment Id:** 352321 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Furthermore, the SEIS fails to link dog walking with document resource impacts. Rancho continues to provide valuable habitat for many endagered species. GGNRA fails to provide any scientific data about the impact dog walking has on the natural resources.
Organization: Montara Dog Group
Commenter: Emily S Benson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1398 **Comment Id:** 352440 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.
Organization:
Commenter: Bruce Yandell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1405 **Comment Id:** 352502 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer reviewed site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate sucha dramatic change to the public's use of their public land. I would request that you retain the 1979 pet policy and remember that it is a recreation area and not a national park.

Organization:

Commenter: Jon Weis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1415 **Comment Id:** 352513 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In different plans I noticed that there are areas where it is suggested "no dogs are allowed". These areas then get a designation of no impact(by dogs) since no dogs are allowed. While logical, in fact, "no impact" is not an accurate designation because dog owners consciously decide not to obey the rules and will take dogs where there is no enforcement at the time.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1419 **Comment Id:** 352519 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I understand that you have not undertaken the peer-reviewed, site-specific studies required by law before drastically altering public use laws. How, then, can you make a proper decision about trail usage in the GGNRA?

Organization:

Commenter: Kaitlin Quistgard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1424 **Comment Id:** 352528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law)that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science and not anecdotes.

Organization:

Commenter: Wendy A Umphrey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1443 **Comment Id:** 352567 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The fact is that the SEIS fails to identify any scientific studies, site specific to Rancho, that document adverse impacts from dog walking on wildlife or on flora at Rancho. Montara Dog Group certainly realizes and accepts the need to restrict dogs (and people) from certain sensitive habitat areas, and will cooperate fully to help protect those areas when they are identified by scientific studies.

Organization: Montara Dog Group
Commenter: William R Bechtell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1445 **Comment Id:** 352571 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.
Organization:
Commenter: Carolyn M Hendrickson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1475 **Comment Id:** 352714 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts.
Organization:
Commenter: Katie Thompson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1482 **Comment Id:** 352875 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: More directly, what specific issue(s) or problem(s) are driving the need for this anyway? It seems as if the changes proposed are based on limited to no study with significant assumptions and "can", "may", "might" type conclusions driving this. Assumptions and a lack of clear harm or impact is not a reason to drive through changes that will negatively impact such a significant base of the users of GGNRA parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Darin Boyd **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1504 **Comment Id:** 352932 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My understanding is that you havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands. Moreover, you have not conducted any surveys on the actual demand for use by the population. I am sure if you conducted a scientific survey of the citizens who have access to the GGRA you would find: 1) a significant portion of them desire areas where their dogs can play off-leash; 2) the majority of citizens do not oppose dogs having off-leash access to 1% o the GGRA; and 3) those limited few who might have a specific objection would be willing to live with a mutually acceptable compromise position. I recommend you carry out such a survey before taking this drastic action.
Organization:
Commenter: Matthew S Oresman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1508 **Comment Id:** 352941 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly oppose the alternatives because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. I want real research, not anecdotes.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1532 **Comment Id:** 353024 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

Organization: Doggie Do Right Dog Training

Commenter: Sue Minsuk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1596 **Comment Id:** 353171 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Organization:

Commenter: Chelsea Novello **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1608 **Comment Id:** 353191 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1615 **Comment Id:** 353208 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: the SE IS contains no peer - reviewed site - specific or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public ' s use of public lands. Retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

Organization:

Commenter: Sylvia Walker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1629 **Comment Id:** 353223 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS still lists impacts that "might", "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

Organization: many see comment for list of some of many

Commenter: richard j lynch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1639 **Comment Id:** 353235 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. They should have to prove it before they legislate it.

Organization:

Commenter: Nina P Le Baron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2663 **Comment Id:** 353269 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: It especially concerns me that the GGNRA is proposing to eliminate land access for people with dogs without any solid science to support that position.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3553 **Comment Id:** 353323 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Where is the evidence that these additional restrictions will provide a public benefit?

Organization:

Commenter: Peck Comstock **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1711 **Comment Id:** 353675 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.
Organization:
Commenter: elizabeth m wiens **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1759 **Comment Id:** 353742 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.
Organization:
Commenter: Diane C Janakes-Zasada **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1796 **Comment Id:** 353939 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.
Organization:
Commenter: Sheryl R Owyang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1881 **Comment Id:** 354429 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My experience at Mori points is that about 40% o all dogs are off-leash even in dogs-on-leash areas. When evaluating dog impacts, given the lack of enforcement, it should be assumed that allowing on-leash use will lead to significant off-lease use also, especially in more remote areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Carlos Davidson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1890 **Comment Id:** 354464 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition to the detriment to our lifestyles, there are a number of reasons that this dog management plan is a problem. For example, there have been no peer review or site-specific studies, as required by law.

Organization:
Commenter: Matthew Gilbert **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1919 **Comment Id:** 354549 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It lists completely arbitrary levels of damage associated with the various alternatives. Some of these are silly in addition to arbitrary - the effects of the policies on a dog owner who no longer can use his favorite or nearby-trail are clearly of a much higher order than the walker who is annoyed by having dogs on the trail. None of the observed environmental degradation is actually linked to dogs. Saying that damage has occurred in dog areas is clearly not the same as dogs have caused damage.
Organization:
Commenter: David V Gainer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1935 **Comment Id:** 354578 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There seems to be little scientific data that demonstrably proves that off-leash dogs, when under the responsible control of their owners, do significant harm to floral, fauna or other environmental considerations in the types of areas addressed by the EIS (I.e., not high sensitivity areas). It seems like policy is being formulated based upon speculation, not facts.
Organization:
Commenter: William B Pace **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2880 **Comment Id:** 354894 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it lacks proper study or fairness. For example, there is no peer reviewed study, just hearsay about damage dogs may cause.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2899 **Comment Id:** 355179 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Mimi Steel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2929 **Comment Id:** 355229 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Peter Olfe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2948 **Comment Id:** 355256 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the "best professional judgment of NPS staff" to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for "proof" that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Rachael Jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2969 **Comment Id:** 355284 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who dont want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and apparently ignored.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Ursula Irving **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2977 **Comment Id:** 355300 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Tracy Barsotti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3015 **Comment Id:** 355359 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not do them.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jason Shulman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3015 **Comment Id:** 355360 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Jason Shulman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3120 **Comment Id:** 355380 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...we have not been shown any real evidence that dogs are hurting the bird population. we also have not seen the results of who has opposed this measure.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: lori kaiser **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4166 **Comment Id:** 355739 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Pam deBruin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4192 **Comment Id:** 355963 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the GGNRA Draft DMP because....WHERE'S THE BEEF?! - site-specific, peer review studies, required by law? that support their conjecture and presumptions to support these drastic changes to a 35-year policy (1979 Pet Policy, still legal and in effect) that used 2 years of real science, studies, and public input from all stakeholders (and actually listened to them). The GGNRA admits they don't have any. They d.elete.d/omitted the scientific studies

that prove the out com e is very different from what they say. The statistics on their own web site contradict their claims.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Jane Shepard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4473 **Comment Id:** 356012 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252).

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Theresa Gaydon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2615 **Comment Id:** 356884 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Adam French **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2617 **Comment Id:** 356909 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who commented on the first plan. In addition, not a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Eileen Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2710 **Comment Id:** 357122 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In 2011 after the DEIS DMP was released and the NPS/GGNRA received over 4700 comments against there DEIS DMP, the GGNRA made a few very minor changes and put the nearly identical plan out as the SEIS DMP on Sept. 6, 2013 with out any kind of Site Specific Scientific Peer Review Studies that are required by Law. This is something the NPS/GGNRA

has skipped in their zeal to disregard the public input.
Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2711 **Comment Id:** 357126 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: All Alternatives (other than Alternative A) relies on studies that do not pass peer review and ignore the peer-reviewed study that concludes dogs are not hurting wildlife in our parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Deborah J Chang **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2738 **Comment Id:** 357154 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am writing to oppose the Preferred Alternative of the Draft Dog Management Plan as it in no way allows for sufficient space for dog owners in GGNRA lands to walk their dogs, either off leash or on. Scientific studies do not back up the extremely restrictive measures that have been adopted in this alternative
Organization:
Commenter: Carol J Arnold **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2741 **Comment Id:** 357159 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2766 **Comment Id:** 357397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.
Organization:
Commenter: john cremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2770 **Comment Id:** 357419 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2771 **Comment Id:** 357428 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357570 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.
Organization:
Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357571 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.
Organization:
Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2826 **Comment Id:** 357576 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they werent supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Darla Spiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2857 **Comment Id:** 357673 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Organization:

Commenter: Carrie Asby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2871 **Comment Id:** 357698 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In particular, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that dogs in Rancho Corral de Tierra are significantly disturbing vegetation or wildlife. The vast majority of the reported "incidents" result from the insufficiently announced/communicated changes in policy from the historical use and access dogs and their owners have enjoyed in the area.

Organization:

Commenter: Gever Tulley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3059 **Comment Id:** 357839 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impact.

Organization:
Commenter: Emily Coon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3100 **Comment Id:** 357904 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There is evidence in the scientific literature that off-leash dogs can have negative impacts on breeding and overwintering Western Snowy Plovers in other locations. However, nowhere in the SEIS is evidence provided that leashed dogs impact the Western Snowy Plover. Throughout the SEIS, the NPS cites a 2001 article by Lafferty to infer that on-leash dogs disturb plovers. The data in this article includes only two events of leashed dogs disturbing shorebirds and there is no evidence that these birds were plovers. This article actually states, "Leashing reduces both the probability that a dog disturbed birds and numbers of birds per disturbance." To use this as evidence that plover disturbance by leashed dogs is a problem is disingenuous.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3100 **Comment Id:** 357905 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS states that banning dogs at Ocean Beach will provide for "consistency with the Recovery Plan for the Western Snowy Plover." In spite of this claim, nowhere in the Recovery Plan does the USFWS suggest banning dogs on beaches that provide overwintering habitat. In fact, the recovery plan recommends leash restrictions to protect plovers, which is exactly what is currently in place at Ocean Beach. The NPS would be consistent with the recovery plan simply by enforcing the leash regulations that are currently in place.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3145 **Comment Id:** 357928 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands
Organization:
Commenter: Sally LaMont **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357936 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Based on these studies that are either not specific to the area in question or >15 years out of date, the SEIS states that off-leash dogs "can" chase plovers and "could" harm them in the SPPA but provides no factual information to support that this actually happens in the

SPPA. While this assertion is theoretically true, the on-the-ground information collected by the GGNRA but not described in the SEIS does not support the rationale that dogs in the SPPA in recent years, leashed or not, have a negative impact on the snowy plovers at this particular beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357937 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The 1996 Plover Report found that most plovers roost near the promenade between Noriega and Rivera. This is not a popular dog area so there is natural separation. The 1996 Plover Report also stated that snowy plovers are not susceptible to the same degree of chasing as sanderlings and other shore birds. "The SEIS provides older data from the 1997 report that had higher numbers of dogs chasing plovers but did not present it's more recent data from the 2006 Snowy Plover Report that does not show this to still be occurring very much, if at all. For example, dogs chased the plovers on 4 occasions in the 2005 study period. This is over an average survey year of 39 surveys and 59 survey hours (2007 Hatch Plover status report). The addendum to this report for 2007 (Hatch 2008) states that there were 30 surveys during this survey year with only 1 incident of a dog chasing a plover.

Organization:

Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357941 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: First of all, the specific cases listed only add up to 190 pet-related incidents - what were the other 779 incidents? Are we to assume they were irrelevant? ï¿½With regards to leash law violations, see the earlier points on compliance which would be greatly minimized if the GGNRA conducted an enforcement program similar to what it has listed for implementation of a no-dog policy. ï¿½With regards to visitors walking dogs in closed areas, I do not know what closed areas exist in the SPPA. I am guessing this is related to the area that was closed north of Stairwell 21 when sewage washed up, which would be unrelated to dog management issues. ï¿½With regards to pet excrement, anyone who walks on a city sidewalk would think that 2 reported incidences over a 3-year period is a low number. I personally find it unconscionable that anyone would leave pet excrement in any public space but I have generally noticed very few incidences of dog excrement in my hundreds of times in the SPPA. Unfortunately, this is not true of the city sidewalks. ï¿½With regards to dog aggression/biting, the risk is actually extremely low. The draft report provided statistics of dog aggression but did not provide total numbers of dogs. Over a 3 year period they cite 21 reports of aggressive behavior but out of how many dogs? I looked through various references for dog numbers. The 2006 plover report gives a rough estimate of 10 dogs per hour encountered. Assuming 12 hours of dog walking time per day, this would result in 120 dogs per day or 43,800 dogs per year. Over 3 years (2008-2011; 1095 days) this would be 131,400 dogs. Twenty-one aggressive encounters out of 131,140 dogs is 0.016%. is a very low number. Even halving the number of dogs and doubling the number of reported incidences of aggression results in a number less than 0.1%. g all these dogs to the Ocean Beach Trail or sidewalks, with less room to spread out, would probably create an issue

rather than solve one. Unless the SEIS assesses impacts of displaced dogs on trail/sidewalks, the claim that a no-dog policy is beneficial to health and safety cannot be claimed. Further, it should be made clear what the level to trigger moderate to major impacts is since the levels of violations and aggression seem very low or potentially solved by an enforced on-leash policy.

Organization:

Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3343 **Comment Id:** 358193 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Organization:

Commenter: Ian Gover **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3566 **Comment Id:** 359244 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephanie S Palmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3582 **Comment Id:** 359253 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, the plan acknowledges there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375). A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote made by NPS staff.

Organization:

Commenter: Monica Camacho **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3646 **Comment Id:** 359296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS document admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show how these areas are affected by the presence of dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), and instead cites anecdotal observations made by National Park Service staff. However, such anecdotal claims have no validity and cannot be used to set policy. I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies (as required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

Organization:
Commenter: Claire McAuliffe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3869 **Comment Id:** 359998 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.
Organization:
Commenter: David Levin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3959 **Comment Id:** 360202 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, we have seen no good evidence to support the current proposed policy changes with respect to dogs on GGNRA beaches. Evidence-based policy making should be central to the stewardship goals of GGNRA and in that regard I feel the administration is failing the public. Nothing I have seen to date justifies the radical policy change that is about to take place.
Organization:
Commenter: John Karr **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3973 **Comment Id:** 360314 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The DEIS includes many unsubstantiated generalizations about the negative impact dogs have on GGNRA's natural resources. I believe there needs to be more fact-based arguments to support this hypothesis.
Organization:
Commenter: Douglas V Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3976 **Comment Id:** 360336 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.
Organization:
Commenter: Brendan Hickey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3997 **Comment Id:** 360432 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, there is ZERO (nil, zilch, nada) consensus in the scientific community that dogs are directly (or at all) responsible for the destruction of habitats, flora or fauna in the GGNRA. And there isn't a single independent, peer-reviewed, site-specific scientific study in existence to support the groundless claims laid out as so-called evidence for the desired regulations. BY LAW, you are required to have the above before you can enact any change. Yet, you don't and you are attempting to force through change (illegally) anyway.

Organization:

Commenter: Jessica Teas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4554 **Comment Id:** 360602 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS plan focusses on things that "might" "can" or "could" happen, but does not give any evidence that these things have ever happened at specific sites. It does not give any data that supports worries that there are major safety issues that necessitates off-leash restrictions. The vast majority of serious incidents in the GGNRA are serious crimes, including murder, that do not involve dogs at all.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen Austin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4583 **Comment Id:** 360677 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I've read this analysis and it is seriously flawed. It fails to use good statistics and relies instead on anecdotal evidence and flawed statistical analyses. This report should be rejected and you should take a better approach to viewing how dogs impact the city. Rather than just picking the negative, you should look at all evidence.

Organization:

Commenter: Jason Holloway **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361117 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS admits there are no scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs. For example, on vegetation or soils, (page 375), so it sites anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. This document, which unfairly sets out to eliminate or displace a major user group, is supposed to be based on science, not anecdotes. Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring. If you have soil or water reports that conclusively link problems directly to dogs, I suggest you provide them.

Organization:

Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361118 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS data still doesnt support claims that there are major safety problems associated with dogs that require off-leash restrictions. In fact, according to GGNRA data collected between 2001 and 2006, incidence reports that involved dogs (7%) d in comparison with the majority of problems, which involved people (93%).k personnel and resources required by visitors for instances of injuries, fatalities, rescues and missing persons far outnumbered the same situations for dogs. In other words, millions of dogs visit the GGNRA every year and the problems associated with them are miniscule at best.

Organization:

Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4624 **Comment Id:** 361144 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Further, I am concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Zack Kamen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4644 **Comment Id:** 361173 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Further, I am concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported: 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: John Delaplane **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4689 **Comment Id:** 361339 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, data shows dogs are not causing problems at the parks. Last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:
Commenter: Siobhan Quinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4756 **Comment Id:** 361425 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The NPS cites incidents related to dogs as a rationale for its proposed restrictions. But the number of incidents reported from dogs, according to the NPS's own statistics, is a tiny fraction of the total number of incidents rangers handle. Citing owners who disobey the rules is a sign of the success of the off-leash policy, not its failure.
Organization:
Commenter: Cameron Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4781 **Comment Id:** 361519 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Lastly, the most recent data that was released by the GGNRA (in 2013) shows that in the last year, out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people who own dogs, there have only been 6 reported dog bites; 5 reported dog fights; 2 cliff rescues; 2 reported cases where people were "scared" by a dog; 1 instance of a wildlife killing; and 1 horse bite incident. Reported incidents involving people are much higher than any statistic involving an incident with a dog. This data, released by the GGNRA, does not support the argument that there is a need for major change. This data also does not support the request for more rangers, which would cost another $2MM per year
Organization:
Commenter: Katherine Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4787 **Comment Id:** 361528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a wildlife biologists who has studied dog and wildlife behavior for years, there are simply no credible peer-reviewed studies documenting that dogs have a negative impact on wildlife in the area.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4788 **Comment Id:** 361532 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Kattula **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4792 **Comment Id:** 361545 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA report cites things that dogs COULD do to cause damage. Where is the evidence? What about the bountiful coyotes on this land? These wild animals COULD pose a much greater danger that our coddled pups. Are you going to remove them too?

Organization: MDG

Commenter: Margaret P Kritzer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361563 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mori Point I Prefer 17A I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to: "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (4x4 vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding). "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a rural park setting. "Area is in a densely populated area with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking. "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking. "Symbolic fencing and signs have been effective in keeping people as well as people with dogs out of sensitive areas

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361564 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Pedro Highlands I prefer 20E I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle club/ motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.) "Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation. "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a park setting. "Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4800 **Comment Id:** 361565 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Rancho Corral Tierra I prefer 21A "I do not support the the preferred alternative of 21F due to "Lack of interconnect-ability of trails "Over stating of damage caused by on or off leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.) "Consideration for ADA accessibility "Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a park setting. "Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience. "Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash or off dog walking "Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by dog walking. "Has been unregulated for 30 years "More research needed due to only being a park for less than two years

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Kent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4815 **Comment Id:** 361579 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization: San Francisco citizen and dog owner

Commenter: Felicia J Zeiger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4840 **Comment Id:** 361620 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The notion that $2,000,000 will need to be allocated for more rangers is not supported by the data. The numbers released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4872 **Comment Id:** 361662 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The 2008 and 2012 visitors surveys, upon which it appears the SEIS conclusions are based, are inherently flawed, thus making any conclusions regarding both current

and future visitor use erroneous. In San Francisco County, the 2008 survey was conducted at Crissy Field, Baker Beach, and Ocean beach for four days (two weekdays, two weekend days) and the 2011 survey was conducted at Fort Funston (two weekdays, two weekend days). This is not a representative sample of park use.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynne Srinivasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4872 **Comment Id:** 361666 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Table 5 shows that over an 11 year period, there were a total of 4,932 reported dog-related incidents out of a total of 45,700 total incidents over this period. This is approximately 11 percent of total incidents and averages about 450 per year. Figure 5 presents the annual visitation to the GGNRA from 1973 to 2011. Looking at years 2001 - 2011, visitation at the GGNRA is approximately 14.5 million visitors per year. This equates to about 3 dog incidents per 100,000 visitors per year or 0.003 percent per year. This is substantially less than approximate 1-2 percent of dog incidents in the United States (Centers for Disease Control and US Census Bureau). Dog-related incident data for the 11 year period for on- and off-leash dogs at GGNRA, which is especially dog-friendly, shows that these incidents are substantially less than national averages.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynne Srinivasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4872 **Comment Id:** 361668 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off-leash violations account for the majority of dog incidents in the San Francisco County sites; 74 percent, including off-leash violations from the Wildlife Protection Area at Crissy Field and the Snowy Plover Protection Area at Ocean Beach (Table 36). These violations do not suggest that there have been any beneficial or adverse environmental consequences. While limiting both on- and off-leash dog access at GGNRA will undeniably be beneficial to health and safety, the current threat to health and safety is below the national average.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynne Srinivasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4883 **Comment Id:** 361695 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I recently became aware of the Park Service's plans to restrict off-leash dog walking on Crissy Field and I am writing to object to this proposed policy. I have reviewed the GGRNR Dog Management Plan and its accompanying EIS and find that the arguments presented in the Plan fail to make a persuasive case for the need for a change from the status quo. Furthermore, the analysis presented in the EIS fails to present actual adverse impacts from off-leash dog use of Crissy Field, relying entirely on speculation as to what "may" happen, or what

"might" be the case. On the other hand, the EIS entirely ignores the very real adverse impacts that would occur if off-leash dog walking were further restricted at Crissy Field.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard Springwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4883 **Comment Id:** 361700 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In twenty years of running on Crissy Field, I once, and only once, saw a dog chase a bird on the meadow. The dog was a puppy who did not know any better, and the bird simply flew away. Dogs are not predators like feral cats. The assertion that the off-leash dogs at Crissy Field endanger wildlife is unsupported by evidence and absurd on its face. I fully support the extensive fencing of sensitive areas to protect landscape and wildlife, including the Snowy Plover nesting area from humans and dogs, but the current policy of allowing off-leash dog walking cannot be shown to have any impact on the well-being of the avian population of Crissy Field.

Organization:

Commenter: Richard Springwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4898 **Comment Id:** 361732 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, the citations regarding dog impacts on wildlife have not been based on actual studies in the areas in question. It should be quite straightforward to study the impact of the current practice of dog walking at specific sites but on literature reviews! Well designed, unbiased studies at the sites regulated by policy are the least owed to a public which will be impacted for decades by any change in policy. There is no need to talk about possible or hypothetical impacts in GGNRA. They have no place whatsoever in the formulation of policy. Surely this is not the same as introducing off leash dog walking for the first time in GGNRA where it never has occurred. In such a case, one might be justified in extrapolating from studies in other areas that are not in the GGNRA. But here we have a perfect laboratory-off leash dog walking is occurring and any impact can be defined with regard to seriousness and then studied in the real world. If it cannot be measured, then it cannot be a basis for policy.

Organization:

Commenter: sanford goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4993 **Comment Id:** 361896 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Moreover, the GGNRA has violated federal law by failing to support its preferred Alternatives with peer-reviewed science. In fact, as was the case with the Drake's Bay Oyster Company, the GGNRA has fraudulently concealed relevant science, including the Warren Study out of U.C. Berkeley demonstrating the absence of any disturbance to the Western Snowy Plover's feeding habits from off-leash dogs.

Organization: Stephen S. Sayad, Attorney at Law

Commenter: Stephen S Sayad **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361914 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The volunteers they use to conduct their "research" on the populations of the snowy plover is all volunteer who come out at varying times of the day, week, etc. There is no scientific approach. There is no one conducting long term research in the standard of viable data collecting to warrant a verifiable and repeatable outcome.
Organization:
Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5021 **Comment Id:** 362132 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as high foot traffic (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ form other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne Rowe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5103 **Comment Id:** 362184 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There also doesn't appear to be one single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (isn't this required by law?) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. I noticed the plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, but without any site-specific evidence or examples that any of these supposed "impacts" occur now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan even admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies of the GGNRA sites that document the "impacts" from dogs on the environment.
Organization:
Commenter: Amy Puffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5177 **Comment Id:** 362452 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils
Organization:
Commenter: Angeline Yap **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362632 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The 2013 SEIS continues to shun real data. Instead it is a veritable stew of "might", "could", and "may". There are no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies included in the SEIS for Muir Beach and the Headlands. The SEIS admits that there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that even show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However, these anecdotal claims have no context-how frequent were they, how serious, etc-and cannot be used to set policy! The SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts from dogs. NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5224 **Comment Id:** 362696 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA has failed to support its Preferred Alternative with facts. There is a glaring lack of scientific studies measuring the impact of off-leash recreation on wildlife. The GGNRA's fight against off-leash recreation has been going on for more than a decade, i.e. plenty of time to do scientific site-specific studies. Instead of vague nightmarish fears about what dogs MIGHT do, there needs to be facts documenting the impact of off-leash recreation as well as a variety of strategies to minimize any unacceptable impacts, if found. For example, there needs to be a study documenting the population of snowy plovers, whether there has been a decline relative to other sites. Did the Ocean Beach population of plover increase when off-leash was banned 11 out of 12 months? Are plover populations at non-dog beaches (Half Moon Bay) thriving compared to Ocean Beach? Or note, the Audubon representative said there are no longer quail at Fort Funston because of the dogs. Are there quail in no-dogs-allowed sites in San Francisco? The quail at the Botanical Garden have disappeared, in spite of having no dogs (and even being provided with a California Native Plants habitat.).

Organization:

Commenter: K Hu **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5237 **Comment Id:** 362746 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I did not see evidence presented of the need to remove dogs from the Rancho or evidence to ban off leash areas. I also would expect any evidence of detrimental effect to be considered alongside evidence of the benefits of recreation and outdoor enjoyment for families with dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Shelly Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5245 **Comment Id:** 362774 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Organization:

Commenter: Frederick R Leach **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362860 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not discuss the impacts occurring to the plover from the marked increase in raven populations, which predate on plover, at Ocean Beach. Ravens, a much larger bird that forage and scavenge closer to the surf, are more likely to be chased by dogs. The SEIS should document the indirect impact on plover predation by ravens and other predators if dogs are banned. Additionally, provide the scientific support that disturbance during the nonbreeding season is affecting breeding behavior. There is much unsupported conclusory statements in the SEIS regarding the impacts to the plover.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362861 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not demonstrate that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. It states that in the last year, out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher which reveals that these dog-related incidents are negligible and do not support a change in management.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5289 **Comment Id:** 362893 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Here are a few questions regarding my serious objections to this proposal: - Why does the GGNRA rely on outdated studies and information for the latest environmental impact statement? - - Why hasn't the GGNRA updated its enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released? - How is it that the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented? How is it the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis? - How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply ignore the

voices of so many individuals, groups and elected representatives? - How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply not consider or address a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS?

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie B Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5294 **Comment Id:** 362910 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Organization:

Commenter: Anna Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5336 **Comment Id:** 362977 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: While we love our dog, and greatly appreciate other dog owners who let theirs play with ours at Crissy Field, if it were clearly established that human interests were significantly diminished by such play, we would be very willing to consider a leash-law change. In our opinions and experience, however, supporting date for such diminishment do not exist.

Organization:

Commenter: Kern Trembath **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5445 **Comment Id:** 363283 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The EIR greatly understates the extent to which visitors fail to comply with dog rules, in GGNRA and in other areas. In fact, I was astonished to read the claim "The East Bay Regional Park system does not have any major compliance issues" (p.31). I spent a lot of time in the East Bay Regional Parks and cannot imagine a reasonable definition of "major" that would result in that statement being true. Specifically, I frequently see dogs that are supposedly "under voice control" chasing birds (including flightless birds such as quail) and deer, while the dog owners helplessly yell for their dogs to stop. Dogs that are "under voice control" when nothing interesting is happening become unmanaged and unmanageable when their instinct to chase is triggered. And I have seen dogs chasing coyotes. Indeed, one dog owner I spoke with says she likes to visit a specific area of Tilden Park because "every now and then we see coyotes, and my dogs love to chase them."

Organization:

Commenter: Phillip Price **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5445 **Comment Id:** 363284 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The evident assumption that dogs that are under voice control will indeed be under control leads to the EIR grossly understating the impacts of dogs in areas where they would be permitted off-leash under some of the plans. Areas that permit off-leash dogs will experience substantial declines in terms of wildlife and bird habitat. This should be acknowledged.

Organization:

Commenter: Phillip Price **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5469 **Comment Id:** 363323 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Organization:

Commenter: Julie Samuels **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5489 **Comment Id:** 363362 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The law requires a peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The data I have reviewed does not support it: in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been only 6 reported dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. Further, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5511 **Comment Id:** 363890 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Has the GGNRA provided any site specific studies to prove that dogs are "in fact" causing many of the problems they proclaim. It is my knowledge that the GGNRA is making ONLY ASSUMPTIONS on the impacts that "might happen" should dogs continue to use the off-leash areas that we have been using freely for decades. Where is the site-specific evidence to support that any of those negative impacts they are claiming are from dogs only? Or, have they ever occurred or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. For the GGNRA's claims that dogs are negatively impacting vegetation or animals, they ONLY continue to make assumptions as there are NO site specific examples.

Organization: SuperDog City, LLC

Commenter: Corey M Vitale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5672 **Comment Id:** 364105 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The GGNRA admits that they have not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document alleged impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. However, the SEIS claims that these unproven impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them. Anecdotal observations made by NPS staff, who may or may not be biased against dog walking, should not be used to set policy.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5676 **Comment Id:** 364110 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am writing to comment on the inaccuracies of the SEIS document addressing dog walking in the Rancho Corral de Tierra which encompasses Montara and surrounding communities. The SEIS does not give, or link to, any documentation for negative environmental impact on this area from dog walkers. There is no logical reason for banning dogs from this area, no scientific data collected, and since the GGNRA has only been managing this area since December of 2011, there is no evidence for the GGNRA to state that dogs have caused any problems here.
Organization: Montara
Commenter: Nancy E Wilder **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5698 **Comment Id:** 364162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.
Organization:
Commenter: Carly M Braak **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5711 **Comment Id:** 364178 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My understanding is that the SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change,

entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5711 **Comment Id:** 364179 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS still lists impacts that "might", "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring. SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not do them.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5711 **Comment Id:** 364180 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the "best professional judgment of NPS staff" to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for "proof" that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Kate N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5741 **Comment Id:** 364220 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there were only a few actual

incidents including: only 6 dog bites report, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. There were 2 additional incidents reported where "people were scared." Taken in context of the hundreds of thousands of dog visits to the GGNRA, this data does not support the requested need for a change. Further, the data most certainaly does not justify the funding request for $2M to fund more park rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Hugh McDermott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5752 **Comment Id:** 364237 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I ask that you consider the data released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. I don't feel that data supports the requested needs for a change.

Organization:

Commenter: Diego E Castaneda **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5765 **Comment Id:** 364269 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The draft dog management plan for the Rancho Corral de Tierra is based on conjecture and guesswork. The fact is that dogs have had free access to the Rancho for years and the plan is concerned with future possible impacts. The plan cites no current impacts of the years of dog usage, and thus lacks scientific merit to restrict dogs in the future. The overly restrictive dog use recommendations would be hardship to both dogs and their owners and it in direct contradistinction of the purpose of the RECREATIONAL area.

Organization:

Commenter: Lawrence M De Young **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5797 **Comment Id:** 364318 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When you look at the GGNRA's own statistics and consider the hundreds of thousands of dog visits annually at Fort Funston, the number of problem dog incidents is astoundingly low. This should be a case of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" instead of throwing $2 million at a bogus problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5797 **Comment Id:** 364319 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no justification in the proposed plan for such drastic changes - - citing

only "potential" conflicts, without any objective site-specific and scientific studies to prove that it's dogs and only dogs that change/harm the habitat. So this is a political decision made by the GGNRA - and political decisions should be made by the people who use the land and pay the salaries of the bureaucrats. Then there's the lack of the required peer-reviewed scientific studies. The GGNRA isn't even following its own rules.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5826 **Comment Id:** 364365 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The main 'argument' of the GGNRA seems to be that 'dogs make birds fly away'. This happens when runners pass birds. This happens when children approach birds. This happens when NPS employees drive past on ATVs. It would be helpful to see ANY numbers that indicate that bird populations have been affected by these dogs- but, after spending 3/4 million USD on the proposal, GGNRA has not been able to provide any compelling evidence against dogs. This proposal is pushed by data from the GGNRA that does not in any way support the proposal.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5829 **Comment Id:** 364374 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: GNRA hasn't conducted peer-reviewed, site-specific studies to prove that the impacts of dogs on the habitat and public enjoyment of the small areas still open to dogs is severe enough to justify such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands. I believe such studies are required in an SEIS under the law.

Organization:

Commenter: Ned Black **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5847 **Comment Id:** 364396 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura I Ducoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5893 **Comment Id:** 364487 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Schnobrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6011 **Comment Id:** 364949 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynette Rosenblum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6068 **Comment Id:** 365297 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Further, the language used in the plan - what "might," "can," or "could" happen - is too vague and does not provide specific instances of these events/impacts happening. There has been no research published or conducted by the GGNRA to support the restrictions mentioned in the plan. It is simply not based in fact.

Organization:

Commenter: Kiley M Nichols **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365367 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Claims by Mr. Dean himself that dog-related incidents are the largest percentage of complaints received by the GGNRA are not supported by either the data provided in the DEIS or SEIS, or by the the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA. Out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs last year alone, there have only been 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident documented. However, the reported incidents involving people are much higher.

Organization:

Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6116 **Comment Id:** 365465 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Undocumented Assumptions - The DEIS is full of assumptions about impacts - things that might or could happen - but there is no evidence of actual observed impacts. Cannot base management plan on hypotheticals. The GGNRA has had years to observe and document actual observed impacts. The fact the GGNRA did not include them in the DEIS indicates they dont exist. Safety - DEIS claims a major safety problem with dogs in the GGNRA. But their own data indicates dogs accounted for only 2% o serious safety incidents involved dogs. The vast majority of serious incidents involved people only. Even if you include non-serious incidents, dogs accounted for a mere 7% o incidents in the GGNRA. Dogs are not a major safety problem.

Organization:

Commenter: SUSAN OBAYASHI **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6131 **Comment Id:** 365530 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is not enough justification in the dog management plan for major changes. Consistency seems to be lacking in the decisions of where dogs are permitted, and in cases the decisions seem arbitrary. For example, dogs are permitted on leash at Ocean Beach in the Snowy Plover Protection area, yet the preferred alternative prohibits them all together from the Wildlife Protection Area and Easy Beach at Crissy Field (where there have never been any snowy plover sightings). The plan states that dogs are also restricted South of Sloat, yet the map shows that area with season closures only; it is unclear if dogs are prohibited from this area entirely. Instead of prohibiting dogs entirely in wildlife areas, they should be allowed on leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Raimondo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6323 **Comment Id:** 365548 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Compliance Not Accurately Evaluated The cumulative impact analyses for virtually all trails, roads and park segments consistently cite park programs such as restorations by the Golden Gate Park Conservancy and "ecologically beneficial" restoration and management activities by others, including controlled burns and invasive plant removal. Impacts at each location and cumulatively are deemed negligible when compared and considered with the restoration and management activities and agency projects. We have several problems with this approach: The impact analyses as well as the Environmentally Preferred Alternative rely on compliance to evaluate the impacts of the Plan as negligible. This is an unrealistic approach because many people will not comply. The Plan, therefore, would be ineffective in achieving impact levels that are negligible. The DSEIS acknowledges that even with "assuming compliance" the preferred alternative would result in localized impacts but these would be considered minor based on the assumption that dog users will comply with the regulations. Repeated observations of dog users over time, however, clearly demonstrate that this is not the case. Dog's users throughout Marin County violate dog restriction, ignore signs and sometimes destroy or steal them, and disregard policies and regulations with impunity. While many people

do obey the law, particularly if they understand why, many will not. This cannot be ignored in evaluating the significance of the impacts. In addition, even localized impacts could be major when endangered species and their habitats are involved. Conclusions that the potential impacts will be negligible are unsubstantiated and invalid until and unless the NPS presents a dependable program that will ensure dog walkers will stay on trails and not harass wildlife or damage habitat. The only way this can be assured is through an effective monitoring and enforcement program. At minimum, there needs to be a strong enforcement program that ensures dogs are restricted from sensitive habitats. It would also be helpful if dogs were restricted on more trails. The DSEIS should acknowledge that non-compliance is a likely possibility and is highly probable. This impact should be addressed by identifying an enforcement program and actions that would mitigate this individual and cumulatively significant impact.

Organization: Marin Audubon Society

Commenter: Barbara Salzman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6142 **Comment Id:** 365605 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS still lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The SEIS says that, during the last six years, National Park Service (NPS) staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. Why didn't they bother to study GGNRA and the Presidio? After all that's the subject at hand. The SEIS relies on anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. These comments have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc.. How can these be used to set policy? NPS staff is recognized for its long-stand bias against dogs and the people who walk them. That's all the more reason to discard any anecdotal observations.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert A Dewey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6155 **Comment Id:** 365650 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Per the latest data released by the GGNRA, the claim that dog-related incidents are the largest percentage of complaints received is false. Out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs last year alone, there have only been 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident documented (2012-2013 report). However, the incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the reported necessity for any change in policy for improved public safety or visitor experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim M **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6246 **Comment Id:** 366193 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Given all the time and effort the NPS has put into the DEIS and SEIS, why has there been no peer-reviewed, site-specific study, as required by law, of dog-walking impact in the GGNRA? The DEIS & SEIS assert that such impact exists and is negative, based purely on anecdotal evidence of NPS staff and a potentially skewed limited sample of respondees to the DEIS. Rigorous scientific peer-reviewed study must be undertake

Organization:

Commenter: Rhonda Vitanye **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6271 **Comment Id:** 366376 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: At a park presentation, as I am concerned about removing multiple Marin headland trails from on-leash walking, I asked a ranger if there had been any reports of dogs to bobcat or coyote or other wild life interactions and she said "NO". So added to the speculative nature of the above "issue", the GGNRA does not seem to have a valid argument. MORE DATA NEEDS TO BE COLLECTED before changing the dog walking access.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6415 **Comment Id:** 366976 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I did some research and looked at the environmental impact report for Dog beach down in San Diego. It unlike the report that this proposal is based on is site specific and peer reviewed. Dog beach is adjacent to a major breeding ground for several endangered shorebirds. they found that the birds were doing just fine even with up to 200 dogs at the beach at any given time. Maybe the park service just needs to stop driving bulldozers through the marsh every 3 years

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher w Gove **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6630 **Comment Id:** 367506 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: NEPA requires evaluation of impacts on the ï¿½cehuman environmentï¿½, but the DEIS fails to do so by failing to adequately address how the proposal affects ï¿½cerecreationalï¿½ values for these local residents

Organization:

Commenter: Francine Fillice **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367991 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is unacceptable that the Dog Management Plan, afready costing millions of dollars and purporting to justiFy major changes to traditional off-leash recreation, lacks the most

rudimentary baseline data. For example, with regard to vegetation, the SEIS specifically states that "Site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have not been conducted at the GGNRA sites ... [regarding] impacts to vegetation or soils from dogs." (6) With regard to water, the SEIS states that "Although water quality monitoring currently occurs at GGNRA, no site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at the GGNRA sites to document impacts to water quality specifically from dogs." (7) With regard to wildlife, "Very few site-specific, peerreviewed studies have been conducted at GGNRA for the purpose of documenting impacts to wildlife as a result of dogs." (8) Yet that lack of data is simply used to create a series of hypotheticals to support the GGNRA position. Thus, dogs "can increase turbidity by stirring up sediments into the water column," (9) dogs "can potentially trample... vegetation... " (10) "dogs can be carriers of exotic plant seeds...." (11) etc. With regard to wildlife, lacking their own baseline data, the GGNRA discussed potential impacts of dogs by referring to other studies in other places, thus ignoring the speciflcities of the GGNRA urban environment. Without site-specific data, this plan, with its profound consequences to off-leash dog walking, is inappropriate, ill-advised, and unsubstantiated, for it is not predicated on even the most basic of scientific data.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367995 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Throughout the SEIS, lacking the authority of site-specific. peer-reviewed studies, conclusions are reached on the basis of anecdote, hypotheticals, and the "best professional judgment of NPS staff." Yet this is the very staff which has been seeking to curtail off-leash dog walking for the past decade and more. This is the very staff who had the "stealth fences" put up overnight at Fort Funston, before being forced by the Federal Court to follow public process. And this is the very staff that has failed to maintain the lands they purport to protect by allowing trails, such as the Sunset Trail in Fort Funston, to fall into disrepair, and by not bothering even to put in a proper toilet at Fort Funston in all these years, although it is one of the most visited of all GGNRA sites. This is the very staff that stated that "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard". (12) GGNRA staff has shown a strong bias against dog walkers and dog walking, and cannot be used to support the conclusions of the SEIS. The use of "best professional judgment" of GGNRA employees represents a serious conflict of interest, and must be called into question.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 368001 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The one place where the SEIS found some hard data was in relation to "dog incidents" in the GGNRA. In the four years from 2008 to 2011, with the hundreds of thousands of people and dog visits to the GGNRA, most of the dog incidents reported had to do with leash law violations. In this entire period, there were only 95 cases of dog bites or attacks. (17) In contrast to this, over that same period, 89% of the reported safety incidents had nothing to do with dogs, and they included murder, larceny, rape, robbery and drugs. The GGNRA should

begin to realize that their safest areas are those where the dogs are, as is the case also in city areas where people walk with their dogs. It would be nice to know the number of people and dogs who walk in the GGNRA, but as the GGNRA is not monitored, this data is unavailable.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368384 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Visitors with children feel that their childs safety is threatened because in fact their childs safety is threatened. The issue with the safety of children is not just a perception of visitors, it is an established fact. This fact is almost completely ignored in the SEIS. It should be noted that although there is a considerable literature on the especial risks of dogs attacking children, there is little literature on other groups that may be similarly vulnerable, including the elderly, physically or emotionally disabled, and those engaging in sports or other physical activity that conflicts with off-leash dog activity. Although the SEIS does mention that children and the elderly have a increased likelihood of being the victims of attacks by dogs, the SEIS does not fully address the safety issue in an explicit manner and apply safety risk management to policy alternatives of dog management.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368393 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When an attack on a child does occur, there is a significant chance of a fatality. One study estimated that a risk of 2 fatalities per 1,000 reported dog bites exists nationwide (Wright 1985). Although most studies show that fatalities typically occur in residential settings, there is still a real possibility of a fatality in GGNRA because of the concentration of visitors with children and lack of control over the type of off-leash dogs present. GGNRA must fully and explicitly address this risk in the EIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The literature reviews for disturbance issues related to shorebirds was initially poor, suggesting that GGNRA staff and EIS authors did not have a good understanding of the basic biology of shorebirds. NPS must realize that allow such a serious impact as offleash dogs into sensitive areas where visitors and resources are put at risk is not a management policy that has been generally allowed. There has been little need to study such a situation, and few specifically relevant studies have been done that address the degree of off-leash activity occurring in GGNRA. Relevant literature searches by non-specialists will often return little information. In order to prepare an adequate EIS, the study authors must have adequate

understanding and knowledge of the basic biology and other relevant sciences pertaining to the resources, sociological knowledge of visitors, and knowledge of canine behavior. It will be difficult for Park staff and contractors who are most likely generalists to obtain the required knowledge without consulting with specialists

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368403 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS has failed to explicitly discuss the issue of risk to visitors. Although it is mentioned that there is literature on the risk of injury to some types of visitors, there is no attempt made to assess the fact that surveys suggest that a high proportion of visitors dont want to be around off-leash dogs and will probably avoid areas of the park where off-leash activity occurs.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368415 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no indication that on-leash as opposed to off-leash dog walking has any less of the health and recreation benefits to humans. The study referred to (Cutt et al. 2008) compares dog owners vs. non-dog owners in a housing tract in Perth, Australia. The study shows slight differences in the total weekly amount of self-reported physical activity of dog owners vs. non-dog owners in this housing tract. However, it is unclear what health benefits, if any, are associated with such differences. There was no statistical difference in vigorous leisure-time physical activity between the groups -possibly the most significant physical activity measured that would be associated with actual health benefits. The study may have just measured the fact that people who own dogs have to walk their dogs, so they walk more than people without dogs on average.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368422 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The NAU survey followed up with respondents supportive of off-leash dog walking, who were asked a series of questions probing specific preferences to gain a deeper understanding of the nature of the dog walkers use of resources, but there was no similar attempt made to gain insight into why, for example, 35% of respondents strongly opposed off-leash dog walking. The subsequent surveys provided no real further insight into the visitor experience related to dog management. The other studies, including TIerney et al. 2009, relied on intercepting visitors at sites heavily used by off-leash dog walkers, where visitors not wanting contact with dogs had been excluded for many years, leading to extraordinarily biased samples

of visitors. (For example, I live within a few miles of Fort Funston but have not been there in over seven or eight years because of the off-leash dog activity.) Nakagawa et al. (no date)s survey compared attitudes across ethnic, age, and income groups but not across various Park user groups. Respondents in this and other surveys were not asked questions specific enough to allow for probing specific preferences related to potential conflict with off-leash dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368425 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The surveys have failed to elucidate the real problems faced by different user/visitor groups in the Park. I am stunned that the SEIS does not refer to the work of Vaske & Donnelly (2007), which provides some insight into why visitors to a park/open space have conflicts with off-leash dogs and to what degree their visitor experience was affected. To be effective in addressing the visitor experience issues at GGNRA related to dog management, a survey would have to involve stratified sampling and detailed probing of the impacts of off-leash dogs on various user groups and vulnerable populations. However, I believe that NPS can make use of existing information if a conservative approach is taken towards addressing the visitor experience issues that are known or can be inferred related to off-leash dog activity in GGNRA.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368429 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The annual number of off-leash violations issued at Baker Beach varied by a factor of 10 between 2008 and 2011 and was greatest in 2009. Why? Does the data reflect something that happened in 2009 or is this great variance symptomatic of the fact that the data does not reflect the reality of off-leash dog violations? In essence, the incident data we have appears to be some artifact of random and/or inconsistent enforcement activities that may vary from site to site, from year to year, or from individual ranger to individual ranger. The data do not allow any conclusions about the relative behavior of dog walkers compared between sites or to the actual behavior at a site or the trend over time.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368430 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Another missing context for the data is a discussion of what proportion of the violations are associated with off-leash dogs vs. on-leash dogs. This result would provide some idea of to what degree different types of violations could be eliminated by limiting offleash activity.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 4506 **Comment Id:** 368684 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Further examining Crissy Field, the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. I cannot tell you the number of children I have seen running on the dunes in protected areas where the snowy plover live, families picnicking and playing football right in front of "protected wilderness area" signs, wind surfers displacing people walking on the beach (with and without dogs), trash being thrown around and not in the cans, etc.... Your data has a very narrow lens and, on its own, simply does not statically support the request the need for a change.
Organization:
Commenter: kathryn Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6564 **Comment Id:** 368692 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Moreover, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The SEIS document admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show how these areas are affected by the presence of dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), and instead cites anecdotal observations made by National Park Service staff. However, such anecdotal claims have no validity and cannot be used to set policy. I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies (as required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.
Organization:
Commenter: Edgar P Bowron **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6565 **Comment Id:** 368696 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The draft plan/SEIS does not present any site-spacific evidence that dogs cause problems or environmental damage. The Supplemental Plan, like the proir Draft Plan, lists purely hypothetical impacts and damage that "could", "may", or "might" happen, but does not provide any credible scientific evidence that any of those impacts ever actually occurred in the GGNRA, or are occurring now. Mere conjecture does not provide a legal basis for valid rulemaking.
Organization:
Commenter: Shannon Yodowitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4287 **Comment Id:** 368816 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Snowy Plovers: Your own research - Forrest Cassidy St Clair and Warren all demonstrate that dogs do not actually impact the diversity, abundance and feeding behavior of the birds. The Hatch report observed 5692 dogs and only 19 chased plovers. Your own studies prove that parents with toddlers, surfers and other park users disturbed the plovers far more than dogs, yet I do not see anything in the DEIS that is further restricting their access. Why are dogs being singled out? Your environmental impacts are a whole bunch of could occur may occur but I do not see a single study that backs this up. You mention Bank swallows, and their nests, but they burrow in the cliffs, areas that dogs simply do not go to. . Ultimately your environmental studies do not seem to support your conclusions and you can be taken to task on this. I have tried to read the DEIS but I have failed to come across any actual solid scientific data that supports your premises. I see a lot of coulds and mays but no actual evidence an no baselines - None. In fact, the one study I did read in full - the one above - demonstrated exactly the contrary to the results you would have preferred. You had all the time to back up your claims with hard data. The fact is you have not been willing to do s - discrediting the scientific basis of this DEIS, or, worse still, the data contradicted your preferred solutions, and you have chosen to ignore it. I could not find an comparative analysis of the No Action option. The impacts appear based on on non-compliance to existing voice control and existing regulations. At some sites, the DEIS prohibits dogs from beach areas to protect shorebirds and stranded marine mammals, yet there is no documentation in the DEIS of current shorebird or marine mammal impacts caused by dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Norton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6685 **Comment Id:** 369016 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The lack of data or any documentation to support the assertions used as justification to proceed with this Environmental Review violates Federal Law as it renders this agency action arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion. Accordingly, this agency action, findings and conclusions should be set aside as prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 706 (2)A.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6685 **Comment Id:** 369027 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Clearly, the failure of GGNRA management to conduct any consistent monitoring of the resources of the GGNRA is a violation of Federal law. The more fundamental problem this SEIS highlights is the fact that GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation for this park property. GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes. It seems impossible that GGNRA management would undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies as a means to identify the alleged impairment.

Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6685 **Comment Id:** 369029 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Absent the existence of any peer reviewed, site specific studies regarding dogs and vegetation, soil, or wildlife, the GGNRA is left to discuss potential disturbance to the resources. Absent reliable site-specific data, or peer review of that data, by law the SEIS should have also dismissed soils, vegetation, and wildlife as resource topics- -as they did with water quality. Clearly the SEIS did not do so as it would have left the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI no legitimate basis to pursue a change in the DMP. Consequently, in the current SEIS, site-specific allegations of user conflict or resource degradation are generally supported by anecdotal comments submitted to the GGNRA in response to the DEIS.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6686 **Comment Id:** 369069 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) the GGNRA promulgated several "studies/scientific claims" that clearly were not peer-reviewed and OBDOG discredited these "studies/scientific claims" quite effectively in our document "Comments on the GGNRA Draft Environmental Impact Statement" (dated May 26, 2011). The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) no longer contains the "studies/scientific claims" that we discredited. Further, in the current SEIS the GGNRA acknowledges that they have no peer reviewed, site-specific studies to support their claims that dogs adversely affect water quality, vegetation, soils, or wildlife in the GGNRA. Rather than dropping these claims the SEIS relies upon possible outcomes, potential for degradation, and so on.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369185 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS provides no site specific peer-reviewed studies to substantiate the claims of resource degradation or destruction. Instead, the SEIS attempts to substitute a review of the "literature" regarding studies in other locations to establish potential harm to the Recreation Area. It is upon this premise of potential harm that they base their proposed restrictions upon the access of humans and their dogs to the Recreation Area.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369186 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS assumes but does not provide the required rigorous analysis that resource conditions result solely from dog use of the sites, discounting the contribution from other visitors and recreational users. The Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS does not address the contribution of other impactful activities, including special events, to the resource conditions and existing impacts at each of the GGNRA sites.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369187 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In many places, the Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS does not provide any data on actual impacts by dogs in areas being proposed for new dog walking restrictions. The words can, may, and could are everywhere in place of hard facts which would have been in evidence had the required "vital monitoring" been done. In places where data are provided, the Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS makes undocumented assumptions of unacceptable impacts and that dogs are the culprits.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369190 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many of the findings in the Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS are founded on a reference included in these documents as Appendix G, "Law Enforcement Data" (NPS 2008c). In the DEIS there was no tangible data. For example, an entry is as follows: "observed a black dog chasing a flock of 14 snowy plovers. I observed the dog chasing the birds from the water to the dunes and up and down the beach for several hundred meters north and south. The dog would charge at the birds and the Plovers would fly away from the dog. Each time the Plovers would attempt to land, the dog would charge directly at them and cause them to take flight again. I watched this happen for continually for eight minutes timed by my watch from 1150 to 1158 hours. Then the dog stopped chasing the Plovers and wandered in the hilly dunes to the north/or several minutes. The dog then returned to chasing the Snowy Plovers for a few minutes more... After the dog ceased chasing the Plovers, they stopped taking flight and started feeding at the water line." Clearly, if this dog was chasing plovers, they would not have returned to feeding at the water line after the chase was over. Plovers feed at the high tide line when the water has already retreated. These were sanderlings, birds that appear almost identical to the plover, are plentiful at Ocean Beach (not threatened or endangered) and can be differentiated by different feeding patterns and different resting patterns. However, in the Appendix G for the SEIS, we have a plethora of graphs outlining the number of violations by area of the GGNRA and year. However, because we have no idea about the level of visitation at each area, there is no context. For 2001-2006, they merely show the number of violations within all of the GGNRA per year. We can see that for 2006, there are 3943 violations, and dog related violations are about 6% of the total. The information we really need, and the GGNRA fails to provide, is that dogs were involved in

approximately 227 violations when 13.5 million visitors (many with dogs) came to the GGNRA in 2006. Does this level of infractions justify a decision at that time to radically change the Dog Management policy?

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6687 **Comment Id:** 369198 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS not only fails to disclose and evaluate the impacts of the alternatives on recreational resources in the context of an urban environment, it dismisses the quality of the urban environment entirely on page 24 where it states, "the quality of urban areas is not a significant factor in determining a dog management plan." As recognized in its enabling legislation, one of the most important aspects of the GGNRA is the sharp contrast between its undeveloped open spaces and the adjacent developed urban environment. The GGNRA's open space and recreational opportunities are intended to provide refuge and relief for nearby urban dwellers. According to NEPA, An EIS is required to analyze the human environment. The federal NEPA rules define the human environment and its scope in an EIS as follows: "Human environment shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment." When an EIS is prepared and human and natural/ physical environmental effects are interrelated, the EIS should discuss all of these effects on the human environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369324 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However, no published study of a breeding bird quantifies the population consequences of disturbance. This is despite the fact that disturbance has been implied as a factor causing population decline for a wide range of species (Birdlife International 2000). Not surprisingly, it is postulated by Ms. Hatch that the energy expended by the plovers to avoid the disturbing dog is detrimental to their overall health and ability to breed, and as expected, no evidence is cited for such a conclusion. It is merely stated in the study, "little research has been conducted on the energetic effects of disturbance and whether individuals can compensate for this lost energy intake and the increased energy expenditure" (p.13). The NPS/GGNRA must consider the fact that the plover is known to annually migrate over 1,000 kilometers. In proportion to their size, this is the equivalent of a 6-foot human running 290 marathons. Does the energy expended when a plover moves 20 or 30 yards to avoid a roaming dog amount to anything significant? Common sense would indicate that the "disturbance" issue has been substantially overblown, and no scientific study exists to contradict such common sense.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369326 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The effects of other wildlife and other possible interferences with the plover's daily activities were given but brief mention and not factored into the study in any meaningful way. These issues include the following: beach cleaning, off-road vehicles driven at night, activity of specific predators, non-native vegetation, shoreline erosion control projects (bulldozers), the actual width of the beach available to the plover, weather, helicopters, airplanes, bicycles, vehicles used during the day by Park staff, kites, and an oil spill. An evaluator cannot distinguish the reason or reasons why a plover flies away to another spot given the presence of a dog 40 feet away, a raven 50 feet away, and a plane flying overhead. Yet in the Hatch study, it seems clear the dog would be identified as the factor that disturbed the plover.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369336 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Daphne Hatch's bias is apparent in the design of this study. The objective of this study is to prove her assumption that the present management which allows off-leash dog use of Ocean Beach and Crissy Field is inadequate to protect the WSP from harassment/ disturbance and other detrimental effects of chasing by dogs. We learn nothing about the relative harassment/ disturbance of the plover from any other source in this study. If plovers are harassed/disturbed 50 times in 5.5 hours by ravens, and one time in that same time period by a dog, is the harassment/disturbance by the dog even relevant? A comparative study model would have been more informative with respect to actually determining what management actions, if any, should be taken to protect the plover from harassment/ disturbance in general. Frankly, this comparative study should have been undertaken in 1993 when the WSP was first listed as a threatened species, before the decision was made (and later reversed by the Federal Court) to require the leashing of dogs to protect the plover.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369338 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In one case, harassment/ disturbance of a plover by a dog was described as "alert posture -stood up and increased vigilance" (in other words, the plover lifted his head up and looked around). Compare this "disturbance" that was classified by a volunteer and the authors of this study as an incident of harassment to the definition of harassment as provided by the ESA. They are clearly inconsistent. In this study, the authors and participants classified activity as harassment/ disturbance that does NOT meet the definition of harassment provided by the ESA.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6688 **Comment Id:** 369344 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our first example would be a site-specific, peer reviewed U.C. Berkeley Environmental Sciences study presented by Megan Warren on May 7, 2007 that concludes within the GGNRA that the feeding of the Western Snowy Plover does not appear to be negatively affected by human and pet recreation. This is highly significant. Because the WSP does not breed at Ocean Beach or Crissy Field, its primary essential activity is foraging and feeding. And, in fact, this study observed that the habitat at Crissy Field is not appropriate as a feeding site and consequently no plovers were ever seen feeding at Crissy Field. If human and pet recreation does not negatively affect these activities, there is no need to restrict recreation in these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369394 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The third study originates from the School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, Norfolk NR4 1fJ, UK., and was authored by Jennifer A. Gill, published in Ibis (2007) 149(Suppl. 1), 9-14. It is entitled, "Approaches to measuring the effects of human disturbance on birds". This study opines, The principal way in which human presence can impact upon wildlife is by altering the ability of animals to exploit important resources. This can operate either through directly restricting access to resources such as food supplies, nesting sites or roosting sites, or by altering the actual or perceived quality of these sites. Direct restriction of access to resources can occur through animals avoiding areas where humans are present. Changes in the quality of sites as a result ofhuman presence could occur, for example, if predators were attracted to areas with humans, or if the presence ofhumans reduced the presence of prey species.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The fourth study was peer-reviewed and accepted on November 12, 1999, and published in Biological Conservation 97 (2001) 265-268. The authors are Jennifer A. Gill, Ken Norris and William J. Sutherland. The study is entitled Why behavioural responses may not reflect the population consequences of human disturbance. The authors contend, The effect of human disturbance on animals is frequently measured in terms of changes in behaviour response to human presence. The magnitude of these changes in behavior is then often used as a measure of the relative susceptibility of species to disturbance; for example, species that show strong avoidance ofhuman presence are often considered to be in greater need ofprotectionfrom disturbance than those which do not.. .By contrast, species which do not avoid disturbed areas are often considered as requiring little or no protectionfrom disturbance.. .From a conservation perspective, human disturbance of wildlife is important only if it affects survival orfecundity and hence causes a population to decline.

Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369409 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Worse yet, when analyzing the number of "disturbances" observed, there is no acknowledgement as to how many of these "disturbances" are actually minor, moderate or major based upon these authors' criteria. It is entirely possible (and I believe probable) that each of the disturbances recorded and utilized to justify the restriction of recreation were merely minor "disturbances". This would be consistent with the conclusions of other studies including the following which states: "...snowy plovers in other areas have become habituated to relatively constant and noni¿½ threatening human trail use." (Trulio, Lynne! , Caitlin Robinson-Nilsen2, Jana Sokale3 and Kevin Lafferty4 1San Jose State University; Lynne.Trulio@sjsu.edu ; 2San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory; 3 Sokale Environmental Planning; 4 Western Ecological Research Center, US Geological Survey NESTING SNOWY PLOVER RESPONSE TO NEW TRAIL USE.)
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369422 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This DEIS/SEIS proposes to ban dogs from large areas of Crissy Field to protect the Western Snowy Plover. It is especially disturbing to note the lack of "vital signs monitoring" in this location because there was a full evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of canine recreation when the renovation/ restoration of Crissy Field was first proposed. This was a perfect opportunity to obtain a baseline monitoring survey and follow through annually to monitor the effects of the originally permitted levels of recreational activity. Instead, you will see that the citizens were advised the recreational interests would be compatible with the renovation/ restoration just until the renovation/restoration was completed. Then off-leash recreation was banned without environmental study. The recent study relied upon within this DEIS has been reviewed in the Ocean Beach section, but it fails entirely to meet standards the NPS sets forth for "vital signs monitoring", and was not peer reviewed. It was unlawful to include the study or its conclusions in the DEIS or SEIS.
Organization:
Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6689 **Comment Id:** 369448 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Consider the article entitled "Management of Novel Ecosystems: are novel approaches required?" authored by Timothy R Seastedt, Richard J Hobbs and Katharine N Suding, and published in Front Ecol Environ 2008; 6, doi:10.1890/070046. The conclusions of the article in short are as follows: "Most ecosystems are now sufficiently altered in structure and .function to qualify as novel systems, and this recognition should be the starting point for

ecosystem management efforts...Novel ecosystems composed of new combinations of species under new abiotic conditions are increasingly common, and adaptive ecosystem management approaches must explicitly acknowledge the current status and predict the future conditions of these systems ...Old styles of management, which focused on removing undesirable species or conditions from ecosystems to return them to a prior condition, may no longer be sufficient... In addition to enhanced monitoring, attention to a rigorous "experimental" design, including reference areas wherever possible, is appropriate if not essential to a defensible, informative, and publicly acceptable management program for novel systems. Awareness among stakeholders, policy makers, and managers of the realities of current and future ecosystem changes is essential to generate management strategies that have positive rather than neutral or negative outcomes.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369485 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS graphs in Appendix G provide no visibility with respect to the number of overall park visits, which is misleading in and of itself. Despite this, the SEIS graphs for 2001-2006 do not substantiate the decision in 2006 to change the DMP. In 2001 and 2002, the dog related incidents are about 9% of the total number of incidents. In 2003-2004 the dog related incidents rise to 14% of the total. However, in 2005-2006, dog related incidents drop to 6% of the total. It would appear things are moving in the right direction, not getting worse so as to justify a DMP change.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6710 **Comment Id:** 369486 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the SEIS, the GGNRA attempts to emphasize data collected in 2007-2011 - data not available to the GGNRA when they decided to initiate the change in the DMP. This datas inclusion is disingenuous at best. At worst, this is evidence of a GGNRA/NPS/DOI attempt to justify their decision to change the DMP by skewing the data for the following years. The graphs in the SEIS for 2007-2011 are of very limited value, as they specify the proportion of incidents and total incidents at selected areas of the GGNRA for each year, with no indication of the number of public visits at each site. Further, had they been engaged in vital resource monitoring as they are required by law to do, we would have data that outlined the problems experienced by location and nature.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen R Golub **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6675 **Comment Id:** 369496 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The most recent data released by the Park Service shows that in the last year

out of hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs there have only been: 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The data does not support the need for change!

Organization:

Commenter: Amanda Bryan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6580 **Comment Id:** 369517 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: -The studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasnt updated the enforcement data since the last draft ETS was released.

Organization:

Commenter: Gina Symczak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6670 **Comment Id:** 369546 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, the Draft SEIS does not provide any statement of overriding consideration for choosing the Preferred Alternative over the Environmentally Preferred Alternative. Indeed, there is no evidence or documentation to support a finding of a statement of overriding consideration, and thus the decision to choose the Preferred Alternative as the Preferred Alternative is arbitrary and capricious.

Organization: Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

Commenter: Norman La Force **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

GD1100 Comments Concerning Guide Dogs (Substantive)

1. Commenters noted that many dogs were being falsely represented as guide dogs. One commenter mentioned that only guide dogs should be allowed in the GGNRA.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 349888 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Also, the ADA is being grossly abused by dog owners who claim their dog is a 'service dog' and get away with avoiding restrictions everyone else follows for the general good. NPS should clamp down on this abuse.

Organization: Evogeneao

Commenter: Len Eisenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1332 **Comment Id:** 352332 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, there is rampant abuse of the "service" dog license/medallion. I see it over and over again - people claim their pet is a "service" dog, but then do not follow any of the service dog requirements/rules

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1909 **Comment Id:** 354524 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no place for dogs in our parks, except guide dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Commenters who trained guide or service dogs noted that these dogs need places to run and release their energy in order to be successful working dogs; they noted that the GGNRA was an important place for this activity.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5373 **Comment Id:** 354494 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I regularly take my service dog to many GGNRA trails and beaches here. This is the third dog that I am training for search and rescue work and she NEEDS to run while under control in areas that allow this. We simply cannot just train at Rodeo Beach!

Organization:
Commenter: Robert Burns **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3222 **Comment Id:** 357994 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Time with dogs is proven to reduce depression and add longevity as we age. Service dogs that provide comfort in hospitals enhance patient well-being. It is also proven that these type of service dogs need their recovery time, in order to serve another day. How do dogs recover? By running, playing and being free. That requires open trails, beaches and Off-Leash, controlled areas in nature - a dogs natural habitat
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3232 **Comment Id:** 358002 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm someone who walks twice daily with my designated service dog in the Rancho Corral de Tierra (Montara) section of GGNRA. When he is exercised, he is calm and can be in therapy mode/perform his service duties. But if he were forced to stay on leash, there is no way he'd get the exercise he needs - - and would therefore not be calm enough to perform the services he is trained for. I moved to Montara 12 years ago for the specific purpose of being able to exercise my therapy dog off leash within walking distance from my house.
Organization:
Commenter: chelsea hardaway **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4538 **Comment Id:** 360493 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My service dog & I really need for our therapy Space to be available for us to continue our treatment
Organization:
Commenter: Gerard T Rowland **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

3. Commenters mentioned the issues of guide dogs being attacked by off-leash dogs. One commenter stated that the GGNRA did not provide enough data on these attacks, and that therefore this did not warrant changes. Another commenter expressed concern with the number of guide dogs being attacked in the GGNRA.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 4359 **Comment Id:** 363802 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The report includes a section that makes some statements about how the policy change is needed in order to reduce the incidence of unleashed dogs attacking guide dogs. This section does not include any data or evidence that there are an unusual number of unleashed dogs

interfering with or attacking guide dogs. In the absence of any data or evidence, there is no basis for imposing a change in policy.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6333 **Comment Id:** 365625 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am at Crissy Field multiple times a week at various times of the day and evening and almost never see Guide Dogs for the Blind training there. I know some people with guide dogs and also service dogs who need to let their dogs get off leash play time and exercise. So just because the (The Seeing Eye Guide 2011, 6) reference projects this fear, people with these working dogs need to be able to exercise their dogs and the GGNRA is a good place for them.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6678 **Comment Id:** 369612 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off-leash dogs pose a particularly significant challenge to individuals who rely on service animals to help them enjoy the GGNRA. As stated in previous comments to the Park Service on this issue, a 2003 survey conducted by a national guide dog user group indicated that 89% of individuals with service animals had their guide dogs interfered with by off-leash dogs, and 42% of graduates of the groups training programs had their guide dogs attacked by off-leash dogs(6). Thus, the failure to enforce the leash law in the GGNRA has exposed those with service animals to a high-risk of interference or attack, and in most cases has precluded these individuals from enjoying the park altogether. This is a disproportionate impact on accessibility for individuals who rely on guide dogs to traverse the park: and since dog management and accessibility planning will impact many of the same locations within the GGNRA, if this disproportionate impact isnt addressed the GGNRA may unwittingly exclude guide dog users from the very places that it is trying to make accessible.

Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Commenter: Laura Horton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 1824 **Comment Id:** 354154 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please let my dogs run off leach on the beaches in California. I have two ATT dogs that are on leaches in the City. They go to rest homes thru the SPCA program but after their visits with the rest home clients they need to relax with a good run on the beaches of San Francisco. They work great with the clients and know that after a good work day they will be able to run and play like dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: joan r lionberger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1837 **Comment Id:** 354324 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For people who respect poop rules our dogs should be able to run free. They are the kindest part of our society today. My dog is a service dog and needs his reward of play please.

Organization:

Commenter: Valerie A Shore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2992 **Comment Id:** 355330 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: People with dogs on leash and service dogs like mine have a right to this open space

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Dr. Gary Decad **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are a surprising number of fraudulent representations of dogs as Service Dogs

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA161486

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

GR2010 Geologic/Soil Resources: Affected Environment (Substantive)

1. **Some commenters stated that off-leash dogs are known to dig in sands and sensitive soils and trample the lands adjacent to trails, increasing erosion. Other commenters feel that nature (e.g., wind erosion, gophers) cause more damage to soils than dogs.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5000 **Comment Id:** 361906 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The accusation that dogs dig up the lawns is incorrect...actually they may dig at the holes that the gophers make, but I have never seen a dog dig a hole in a lawn that is not already dug up by gophers.

Organization:

Commenter: Louise Todd **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6639 **Comment Id:** 368126 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Ft. Funston and all other Headlands: This cliff and beach area is more remote and more suited to less disturbing waterfront recreation, it still presents... trampling damage to native plants and chasing of bird life in fields and beaches, - places hikers and equestrian recreation in constant unwelcome and often volatile surprises on trails from dogs allowed to get ahead complacent owners, - expends too much public money to secure safety and rescue from falls off of cliffs - compromises sensitive cliffs from even more rapid erosion. Off Leash dog use must be confined to the most common sense remote areas of Ft. Funston and all other Headlands regardless of size. All trails whose sides cannot be fenced must be for Dogs On Leashes Only. Enforcement of beach and trail use must be strictly enforced. Map 16-C closes illustrates an acceptable compromise with the EXCEPTION that the inland off-leashes area and next to the parking lot MUST BE REMOVED and allow for dogs to be released ONLY when they get to the beach. More sensitive trails must be removed and ON-leashes until they arrive completely down the trails to the beach is acceptable. Map 16-D is preferred, but it would be hell frozen over to enforce.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 45 **Comment Id:** 338014 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I for one am tired of all the dog feces on strewn on Ocean Beach. By and large most owners are responsible, but you can't get all the waste, and frankly who wants that job? It's unsightly, and detracts from the enjoyment of walking on a clean beach.

Organization:

Commenter: J Zolli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1653 **Comment Id:** 353469 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I recall hearing that one of reasons for restricting dogs was the wear and tear they cause. Well, if you frequent Fort Funston, you know that it is not the dogs or people - it is Mother Nature blowing wind and sand to cause erosion and change. Please don't punish dogs and dog owners for what nature does to the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1669 **Comment Id:** 353517 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Responsible dog owners don't let their dogs dig or hunt wildlife. I walk every day and have not seen severe destruction caused by dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Ceisel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3346 **Comment Id:** 358197 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Over the years I have seen how dogs have severely eroded Fort Funston's grounds and how dog lovers enjoy watching their pets chase foraging birds on the beaches. How will Kildeer and Snowy Plovers lay eggs with romping dogs everywhere? Knowing how hard that is on the wildlife makes me deeply sad. Some species are getting driven out of San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Virginia Stearns **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4956 **Comment Id:** 361831 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A lot of digging activity by dogs makes areas to both sides of the trail look like hog wallows which raises concerns about erosion.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 5251 **Comment Id:** 362811 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have never seen a dog fight or any person be harmed by a dog. I have seen families, couples, and professional dog walkers, all enjoying the ocean and the trails. I have never seen a dog digging in the dunes or disturbing the birds nesting in the cliffs.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan Nightingale **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5885 **Comment Id:** 364461 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Aside from harrasing humans and leashed dogs, I have observed uncontrolled pets chasing birds, running through and pooping in naturaly sensitive areas, digging for gophers and voles in erosion vunnerable trail banks, attacking ducks at El Polin, and herons, seagulls, and numerous shorebirds at Crissy field as well as on the beaches. I once saw a large dog get dangerously close to a great blue heron at Ft Scott, ending the magnificent bird's patient and graceful hunt for a meal.
Organization:
Commenter: andrew morrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364789 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The vast majority of erosion on the Rancho and Montara mountain is caused by mountain bikes going off-trail. That is patently obvious to anyone who hikes these hills. Also, my personal safety has been threatened numerous times by speeding mountain bikers, but never by a dog. In a recent event, a mountain biker came down a ridge at about 50 mph - and fortunately yelled in time for me to jump out of the way.
Organization:
Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364804 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If there is evidence at Rancho that dogs are creating erosion or environmental damage, please refer me to those reports - because I do not see dog-related impacts.
Organization:
Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6114 **Comment Id:** 365438 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The running loose of the dogs is not good for the beach. It is harmful to the carefully restored natural areas. It is a death sentence for the birds. It makes no sense at all. Allowing it is just giving in to the self-indulgent, selfishness of the dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie J Friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6622 **Comment Id:** 367473 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If erosion is an issue, stop killing off the ice plants that for years have prevented erosion only to have it replaced with so-called "native species" that are not capable of retaining the sand.
Organization:
Commenter: A. C Eisenberger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2445 **Comment Id:** 358947 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Further, the cliffs on the north end of the park have totally eroded away. Not because of dogs or people, just because of Mother Nature. The park is changing all the time due to weather. Dogs and their owners shouldn't be penalized for that fact.
Organization:
Commenter: Katherine R Garn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368785 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SEIS, page 425, continues the bogus claim made in the DEIS that [Recreational] disturbance of the cliffs in most instances would potentially contribute to cliff erosion [at Fort Funston]. In fact, as in the DEIS, GGNRA offers absolutely no evidence that recreationists contribute to cliff erosion at Fort Funston. The cliffs at Fort Funston have eroded greatly over the last fifteen years-because winter storms pound the base of the cliffs. Period. There is no other source of cliff erosion that anyone has measured or reported.
Organization:
Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

GR4000 Geologic Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives (Substantive)

1. **Commenters state that the management plan is contradictory in its rationale and allowances in specific areas, such as restrictions of on-leash dog walking on the compacted trail at Oakwood Valley and the allowance of off-leash dog walking at Little Beach hillside trails.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 223 **Comment Id:** 350139 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Your proposed policies are in contradiction to the conclusions you draw in the study. To whit, you conclude that dogs have minimal impact on compacted trails. On the south loop of the Oakwood Valley Trail, where the GGNRA plans to mitigate dogs off-leash, the park service built a compacted trail (built by the Conservation Corps.)

Organization:

Commenter: Laurie Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 369 **Comment Id:** 351274 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In the NPS's "preferred alternative" for Muir Beach, leashes would be required on Big Beach. The NPS's justification for the workability of such a change is that Little Beach is there for all who want to let their dogs run. From an environmental standpoint, we are concerned for the continued erosion of the hillside trails and the potential increase of dog waste left at these trailheads.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Wynn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

HS2010 Health and Safety: Affected Environment (Substantive)

1. **Many commenters recognize that there are many responsible dogs owners with well-behaved dogs that visit Golden Gate National Recreation Area; however, they are affected by off leash dogs that are not under voice control. Commenters are concerned about the affects the off-leash dogs have on wildlife and habitat, as well as other park visitors. Commenters noted that the behaviors of some dogs limit or prohibit the areas that other visitors can go to recreate, as they fear being harassed by off leash dogs. Additionally, many commenters reported confrontations from hostile dog owners and commercial dog walkers. Commenters argue that the park should be a place for people to recreate first and foremost without fear of being bothered by off leash dogs.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 3391 **Comment Id:** 358314 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: An important reason why people visit parks is the serenity and beauty there. Many dog owners are respectful of others and many dogs are well-trained. But San Francisco also has its share of irresponsible dog owners, and out-of-control dogs. This can be a threat, not only for our varied wildlife, but also for our citizens, especially children and seniors. Also the presence of too many dogs degrades the natural environment of the park. We all deserve a place where we can relax and enjoy our precious coastline without being disrupted by unruly dogs and their natural instincts to chase after wildlife - or people

Organization:

Commenter: Amy Haskell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4118 **Comment Id:** 362044 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Improve visitor and employee safety, and Reduce user conflicts These two goals are closely related, and heavily impacted by the current dog use practices. We have witnesses numerous incidents of close calls where children and adults were put in harms way by reckless, out of control dogs that were clearly in sight of their owners, who chose to do nothing. We have been accosted by dogs while trying to sit and enjoy a snack on the beach, twice in just the last few weeks, once at Stinson and again at Muir, both under relatively uncrowded conditions, due to the obvious negligence of the dog owners. Maybe they had "voice control", and chose not to exert it, or maybe they really did not have control. Their owners were oblivious, taking no action, as is observed to be the case the majority of the time. A month ago, we witnessed a man carrying a baby being nearly knocked over by a dog running full speed back and forth across the bridge at Rodeo Beach, again to no reaction by the apparently oblivious owner of the dog. The lack of enforcement of rules and current practices are putting all users and the NPS at elevated risk of injury and conflict, and putting the NPS at greater risk of liability for fostering user conditions that have clear and preventable hazards like out of control dogs.

Organization:
Commenter: greg norby **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5965 **Comment Id:** 364821 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a senior diagnosed with osteoporosis, I am constantly fearful of being knocked over by dogs running at large in areas where they are supposed to be leashed or are not allowed at all. So many of my favorite beaches and parklands are now areas I am forced to avoid due to the impacts of dogs off-leash. I fully understand why people like to run their dogs off-leash but it should not be at the expense of other parkland and beach users.
Organization:
Commenter: Gill M Greensite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366031 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Notably, the American Veterinary Medical Association's Task Force on Canine Aggression and Human-Canine Interactions clearly states that dog bites represent a demonstrable threat to communities and that dog bite prevention requires (1) acknowledgement of the issue, (2) clear and deliberate action to prevent bites, and (3) a transparent and credible reporting process for interactions. The AVMA specifically concludes that "[r]easonable and enforceable laws or ordinances are required for good control of unrestrained or free-roaming animals..." in order to prevent bites. Moreover, as discussed above, non-dog owners should be given a choice before interacting with off-leash dogs. A non-dog owner will have no legitimate grounds for complaint if he or she interacts with a dog in an appropriately enclosed ROLA. Complaints to this effect should decline considerable.
Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366917 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: But it is not just park flora and fauna that are negatively impacted by pets. On several occasions as I have hiked in national parks or strolled along a park beach (more often than not where pets are prohibited, but also frequently in areas where they are at least required to be on leash), I've encountered off-leash dogs running out-of-sight of and well ahead of their owners, and frequently out of earshot. A number of these dogs have charged me, and many have made contact. So far, I have been fortunate and have not been bitten or injured. The same cannot be said for many of my friends or their pets which were on-leash. When I politely try to inform the dog's owner of the park regulations pertaining to pets, the owner more often than not interrupts me and generally is downright rude, making comments such as "Mind your own business" or "Go home." My friends relate similar stories. Granted, many pet owners are responsible and do not take their dogs where they do not belong, but it seems as though many of the pet owners who take their dogs to national parks are not amongst the ranks of the responsible or courteous. I grew up with dogs and am therefore familiar with them and know how to react to

the dogs charging at me, but it still is not a comfortable situation to be in- -not knowing whether the dog will actually attack or not. And for those who are unfamiliar with or afraid of dogs, such encounters are terrifying.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. **Many commenters, including those that do not own dogs, feel that the presence of dogs and dog walkers make Golden Gate National Recreation Area safer. Visitors, especially the elderly and women, feel a sense of security walking with their dogs or walking in the presence of dogs.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1520 **Comment Id:** 352978 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Frequently, I visit a park to find only dog-people and maybe joggers. Joggers race by, often with ear-buds, internally focused. Dogs and their people walk slowly and pay attention. By doing this, they make the parks safer for everyone - especially lone older hikers like me.

Organization:

Commenter: Rupa Bose **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1682 **Comment Id:** 353557 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs provide a sense of security to their companions. I like to run or walk alone with my dog. Many of the GGNRA trails (i.e. Sweeney Ridge) are in areas far away from neighborhoods and where normally there are few people.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4584 **Comment Id:** 360983 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is also important to me that my wife and children have a safe place to go when I am traveling. The presence of other dog owners and professional dog walkers adds a critical element of safety to these areas. People walking their dogs are alert to things that do not look right and are always quick to help others at the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael Carboy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Walking dogs off leash provides many people in San Francisco with opportunities to exercise, stay healthy, and socialize. Many commenters believe that opportunities such as this create stronger, safer communities and improves the lives of people and dogs. Many commenters who do not own dogs share the same beliefs. Conversely, one commenter state**

that according to one study, there is no difference between the health benefits of walking dogs on or off-leash.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1268 **Comment Id:** 352199 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Although we don't have a dog we find extreme relaxation and enjoyment from watching other people's dogs happily prancing along the beach. When we are stressed and see the dogs it helps lower our blood pressure and provides a medical benefit both physically and mentally for us.

Organization:

Commenter: Vivian Vosu **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1613 **Comment Id:** 353204 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many people (like me) depend on their dogs for their day to day companionship and exercise. There is ever-growing science that shows that these animals have a strong, positive influence on the health and well being of this population, and therefore of society as a whole.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah Bertola **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3129 **Comment Id:** 355390 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... people and their dogs need a safe place to exercise and socialize. Besides the obvious health benefits of outdoor exercise, these areas help bring people together, a chance to know their neighbors and feel connected to their com munity by sharing a simple and natural com mon interest.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Rebecca Cubba **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2866 **Comment Id:** 357688 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a senior citizen and I attribute my relative good health to the fact that I walk with my dog at least twice a day every day. It keeps both me and my dog in excellent shape, both physically and mentally. It is a known fact that a well-exercised and socialized dog is a good dog, one that is friendly toward people and other dogs. A dog constantly kept on leash is not a well exercised dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrew J Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3323 **Comment Id:** 358146 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a medical professional, I know how important it is - for both physical and emotional health - that people stay active and enjoy the outdoors. Dogs have been shown to improve physical fitness and provide multiple psychological benefits.* Dogs encourage people to get outside, be active, and enjoy this area of natural beauty that has been set aside expressly for that purpose.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Neill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4943 **Comment Id:** 361802 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Furthermore, these recreation areas are intended to function as social "steam release valves" to allow residents of a heavily populated Bay Area access to fresh air, quiet, undeveloped scenic land to relax, get exercise, spend time with friends, and enjoy some peace. I respect the National Park Service's commitment to ecological protection, but I know that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was given over to National Park Service leadership with the agreement that these parks were to remain as recreation areas (which we know serve a different purpose from much-needed nature refuges).

Organization:

Commenter: Shana Goldin-Perschbacher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6215 **Comment Id:** 366133 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Limiting access for dogs would also limit access for so many dog owners. For so many people dogs are a huge and enriching part of our lives. Dogs do so much for people with disabilities, people who may suffer from depression, people that may otherwie not make it out of their houses and into the parks. Dogs help people feel connected and can easy anxity. walking dogs daily can have great health benifits for dog owners. My dog has got me through some pretty rough times. Enjoying our parks is one of my favorite past times and is an enriching experience and great luxury that I do not want to loose.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368415 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is no indication that on-leash as opposed to off-leash dog walking has any less of the health and recreation benefits to humans. The study referred to (Cutt et al. 2008) compares dog owners vs. non-dog owners in a housing tract in Perth, Australia. The study shows slight differences in the total weekly amount of self-reported physical activity of dog owners vs. non-dog owners in this housing tract. However, it is unclear what health benefits, if any, are associated with such differences. There was no statistical difference in vigorous leisure-time physical activity between the groups -possibly the most significant physical activity measured

that would be associated with actual health benefits. The study may have just measured the fact that people who own dogs have to walk their dogs, so they walk more than people without dogs on average.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

4. **Dog waste is a large issue about which many commenters are concerned. Feces that is not disposed of properly and urine can create odors and present health threats. The presence and smell lessen many commenters' experiences in Golden Gate National Recreation Area and reduce the area where many choose to recreate.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1002 **Comment Id:** 351023 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is too bad that dogs spread diseases, such as the recently reported outbreak of distemper in the Tam Valley neighborhood, and are generally hard on the environment. Some owners are good about cleaning up after their dogs, but others think that dog poop is biodegradable and so it is "OK" to leave or throw into the creek, with or without bags. They don't realize that not only diseases, but parasites and medications are spread throughout the environment every time a dog leaves poop behind. Not only that, but the scent will linger and encourage other dogs to mark the same area.

Organization:

Commenter: april post **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 632 **Comment Id:** 352779 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The document does not provide adequate data to support its claims that dog conflicts are a significant issue. In my experience walking my dog regularly at Crissy Field, I have very rarely witnessed dog conflicts; dogs are generally well trained/controlled. The experiences I almost always witness of dogs at Crissy are experiences of joy and contentment, and not conflict. The document should modify its discussion of dog conflicts to more accurately characterize the issue - which is largely a non-issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Block **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3143 **Comment Id:** 357934 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having walked a dog (and small children) on the Ocean Beach Trail, I would assert that it is not an acceptable alternative given the incompatible use by bicyclists who ride too quickly to make it safe to walk there with dogs or children. The path is only 8-10 feet wide (and narrower in spots with significant ice plant encroachment) and has no lines. It is common to have bicyclists come whizzing up from behind with no warning. I have myself nearly been hit multiple times while jogging on the path (note that I do not wear headphones). I dont have my

children walk on the path and I have seen small dogs get yanked out of the way at the last minute due to speeding bicyclists. A path with only 4-5 feet of room in each direction and bicycles whizzing by is not an acceptable alternative to the option of on-leash walking on the beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Meredith Kurpius **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5664 **Comment Id:** 364095 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Asking the public to share sandy beaches with dogs that are defacating and urinating on a constant basis goes against all of the historical norms of prudent public health and safety standards. No responsible parent would allow their child's school playground to be turned into a off leash dog park. In fact, state law prohibits this. Why should it be any different in public parks? People and their children use the sandy beaches for many activities that involve close contact with the sand on bare skin. In fact that is one of the joys of beach recreation, feeling the warm or cool sand on your body while you listen to the sounds of the surf or birds or nothing at all. Allowing dogs and their owners, whether leashed or unleashed, to freely cover the beaches with urine and excrement (some of which gets picked up and some that doesn't) flies in the face of commonly held public expectations for clean, safe and secure beaches.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. **Commenters feel that the SEIS misrepresents the actual number of dog-related incidents, many stating that they have never seen an issue with off leash dogs despite regular visitis. Many commenters reference the law enforcement citations, saying that humans are more dangerous through hostile and illegal behavior, as well as through recreational activities (e.g., bike riding and unsupervised children).**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1236 **Comment Id:** 368761 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they werent supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) he GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369657 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The CHIRPP study found that children between 2 and 14 years old sustained over 70% of all bites. Most of the dogs involved in the bite incidents (65.2%) either the victims dog or the dog of a friend, acquaintance, neighbor, or relative. Only 12.2% were stray or unfamiliar dogs. The majority of the dog bites (64.5%) ened in someones home (either the victims or another persons home). Only 3.1% of dog bites in the CHIRPP study (a total of 38 incidents) occurred in a public park, in conditions like those in the GGNRA. A majority (50.3%) he victims had been interacting with the dog before the bite - petting, handling, feeding, walking or playing with, hurting or provoking the dog, or disciplining the dog. The CHIRPP results are similar to those reported in the United States. The Centers for Disease Controls MMWR weekly from July 4, 2003 reported that 42% of all dog bites occurred among children under 14 years of age, and cites research that indicted that in children under 18 years old, 80% of bites were inflicted by the familys own dog (30%)o neighbors dog (5 0%).s report can be found at: http ://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5226a1 .htm. In other words, the chance of being bitten in a park like the GGNRA by a strange dog that you have not interacted with is pretty slim. Yet, that information is not included in the SEIS. Instead, the reports about dog bites are presented in a fairly alarming manner that gives the impression that dog bites are a significant safety issue in the GGNRA, when the reality is they are not. I presented all of this information to the GGNRA as part of my comment at the final meeting of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee. Clearly, they did not read it.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1844 **Comment Id:** 354338 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Bicyclists and uncontrolled young children are a far worse safety risk in the GGNRA than dogs - particularly at Crissy Field. Bicyclists and unsupervised children routinely run uncomfortably close to pedestrians, cause collisions and ignore basic courtesy. If the GGNRA wants to increase safety at Crissy Field, it should: (1) either ban bicycles or begin strict ticketing of bicyclists who ride too fast and too close to pedestrians.

Organization:

Commenter: David Collins **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2645 **Comment Id:** 356983 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The area now known as Rancho Corral de Tierra has been an important part of our community for as long as I can remember. I've walked my dogs off leash in the area behind Farallone View Elementary School since 1998. I have never witnessed a serious altercation between dogs and humans in the hundreds of walks I've taken. Equestrians, bicyclists, runners, hikers and dog walkers have co-existed peacefully for years. I do not understand the need to change the off-leash policy. I often walk in the mornings and afternoons and rarely see anyone except fellow dog walkers, most of them locals.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer L Hubbart **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 15 **Comment Id:** 337972 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I applaud the continued reasonable restrictions place on dog walking etc in our national parks/recreation areas. As a resident of San Francisco, I see daily problems with dog owners at Ocean Beach allowing their (illegally) off leash dogs to chase sea birds for hundreds of yards and to urinate all over areas where other users (children, surfers, etc) then lie on the sand. These area are national parks NOT DOG parks and someone needs to speak for the wildlife and other users aside from dog owners.

Organization:

Commenter: charles masud **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 37 **Comment Id:** 338000 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: When me and my 5 year old daughter are walking, and an off-leash dog comes running towards us, we have no way to determine what its intentions are. Will it stop, will it bite . . . . or what will it do? And if it only ends up jumping on my daughter to try to lick her, the dog usually knocks her down in the process. In any event, we are both fearful in this scenario. While some dogs are responsive to verbal commands, most seem to be undependable to control their natural inclinations unless on a leash. What not use a long leash and reel your dog in when approaching other people? The public then has the option of coming over to pet your dog, or let it jump on them if they so desire.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 85 **Comment Id:** 344094 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs lose in our set-up and landing areas is unsafe both for direct danger and distractions that can can cause accidents. Our pilot community has many dog owners with trained well Behaved dogs. It is the people (dog walkers to many dogs) who with careless owners cause our true risk. It is unfortunate If pilots would have to leash their dogs?

Organization: Fellow Feathers

Commenter: Ben R **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 125 **Comment Id:** 346275 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog owners don't ways pick up their dogs' poop, or they do if someone is watching, then toss the baggie somewhere. Is there any way to gauge how many gallons of urine is left in our parks? And am I sitting in it?

Organization: 1550 Bay St Tenants Association

Commenter: Janora A Bulechek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 153 **Comment Id:** 349878 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Nothing makes my dog happier than running along the water at Ocean Beach, and for a disabled person like myself this is beneficial in more than one way. I cannot walk my dog on a leash because of a back problem I developed this summer. The ability to let him off the leash so he can sprint back and forth between Balboa and Lincoln allows him to get plenty of exercise without hurting my back. I get so much joy out of watching him and other dogs chase tennis balls or run in circles, and he gets good social skills and a chance to stretch his legs. The idea of restricting him onto a leash while at the beach makes my heart sing as it would take the wind out of his sails and not allow me to bring him there anymore.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah R Gherini **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 157 **Comment Id:** 349892 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: People get a lot of emotional and physical benefits to dog ownership and it would be humane to nurture this relationship.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah S Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 161 **Comment Id:** 349906 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In view of the September fatal case of a boy killed by dogs in San Bernadino, I am extremely concerned about the safety of humans attacked by pets. I can understand pet owners love their dogs, and almost all human want safety. Dog attacks can be considered as assult with a deadly weapon and the owner is ultimately responsible. Pets running around in public places including our National Parks posed a threat to human safety and to the fragile flora and fauna. Their waste invit flies which can spread diseases. Dogs on leash is the least dog owners can do and yet they are left roaming around freely.

Organization:

Commenter: chi wai **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 169 **Comment Id:** 349922 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Fort Funston and Crissy Field has been off limits to our family for some time. Not everyone loves dogs, in particular, my daughter is deathly afraid. We have only been to Fort Funston once, but were soon surrounded by unleashed dogs and had difficulty even trying to leave. We faired no better at Crissy Field. We had to leave since dogs were barking, peeing and pooping as the kids tried to play. My daughter was so frightened and had to retreat to her chair as dogs ran around her. We haven't been back to the beach since. It is also unsanitary to have kids playing in the sand and water at the same time dogs are peeing and pooping in it. We had the

same experience at Ocean Beach and Baker Beach so we don't go to these places. It's unfortunate and limits should be put in place and enforced so everyone can enjoy the parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Anastas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 173 **Comment Id:** 349927 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I was in the GGRNA for a walk of about 1.5 miles along Oakwood Valley Trail recently and saw no less than 10 piles, or bags of dog feces along the way back to Tennessee Valley Road. I do not think it is a good idea to allow dogs on trails, but fire roads could be limited to lease only access. I live within a mile of many of the GGRNA trails and find dog feces littering the streets in my neighborhood and on the trails. Irresponsible dog walkers frequently trespass on private and public land without regard to what the dog is doing. If dogs are allowed the same level of access to GGNRA land, it will continue to be a dumping ground where dogs are allowed to damage habitat and harm wildlife. Dog owners aren't taking responsibility to clean up after their animals in my neighborhood, what do expect them to do on park land where there is no enforcement of proposed rules?

Organization:

Commenter: Jerry D Jenkins **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 177 **Comment Id:** 349988 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I live right below the trail head at the top of Donahue St. When my wife and I first moved here we were excited about using the trail for walking our dog. 2/3 of the time we have tried taking him up there he has been charged and attacked by off leash dogs that are not even slightly under voice control. One time the owner of the dog was a least 1/8 of a mile behind the dog when he attacked ours and she had no idea that anything had happened until we passed and asked if that was her dog. The thought that the dogs up there are under voice control is a joke and I can prove that any time simply by taking my dog up there. The amount of dog walkers that flow through there on a daily basis that unload 6-8 off leash dogs from the back of the trucks is quite surprising. The entire parking pad up there has an overwhelming smell of dog urine because of the amount of people that unload cars full of off leash dogs and let them do what they will. I live close enough to the trail head that I hear people yelling for their dogs that have run off a couple times a week. There is an extremely small portion of people that use the trail that have dogs that are under voice control. The fact that I cant take my dog up there without being attacked is frustrating. We live in an area littered with off leash dog parks, but we also live in a area full of entitled people that believe they can commandeer any public park and turn it into there personal dog park regardless of how well or poor there dog behaves.

Organization:

Commenter: Mickey Rack **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 354 **Comment Id:** 350857 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs urinate on the path, on the field and on the beaches making for unsanitary conditions, especially on the beaches where children are playing the sand.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 359 **Comment Id:** 351132 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am writing to you in much distress because of the ongoing dog situation at Crissy Field. I continue to be frightened at walking on the path and on the beach because of large, aggressive dogs off leash. I frequently have to turn back from my walks because I encounter a pack of them fighting, barking, jumping. I am so upset about this matter that your organization continues to allow dogs and dog owners to control Crissy Field. I simply cannot understand it. At the very, very least, the dogs should be on leashes. And, in my opinion, they should be restricted to a specific area and not given free reign of all areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary Faust **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 365 **Comment Id:** 351266 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am 88 years of age, trying to recover from a spinal fracture. Walking is essential but hazardouse where irresponsible owners are allowed to let their dogs off-leash. This has denied me the pleaseure and healing of Ft. Mason Meadow, Muni Pier, and the Marina-Crissy Field-Ft. Point route

Organization:

Commenter: Dennis McDaniel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 399 **Comment Id:** 351316 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog recreation (walking on and off leash) is critical to my needs for fitness & well being.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 428 **Comment Id:** 351354 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off-Leash Benefits For the Two-Legged Companions: - Human Socialization - Humans benefit from the community and friendships established with other walkers. - Family Outdoor Enjoyment - The whole family, including its four-legged members, can lead active and healthier lives while experiencing the joy of outdoors and beauty of our natural environment. Such family activities encourage children to appreciate responsible pet supervision as well. - Contagion of Play - Humans, studies show, catch the joy of play and obtain great enjoyment

from watching dogs run and play. - Exercise -Allows humans to walk or run with their dogs and contributes to physical health.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 829 **Comment Id:** 351406 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I regularly take my dog to the trails around Tenn Valley and Miwok. These are already very limited trails and when running I not only feel safer with my dog, we both are enjoying the outdoors and exercising... primary reasons I moved to Mill Valley!

Organization:

Commenter: Kara Teklinski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1058 **Comment Id:** 351497 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The garbage cans at Crissy Field contain so much dog waste that you can smell them from several yards away. Also, I do not believe that any dogs should be off leash at all in these areas as they are a menace to wildlife and other park visitors. I have witness several dog fights, one at Ocean Beach that resulted in a dog dying due to another dog attacking it because the owners couldn't control the animals.

Organization:

Commenter: Anastasia r Beckett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1141 **Comment Id:** 351700 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have been snarled at and threatened by two different off-leash dogs in the past year - one in Golden Gate Park, which I managed to scare away by yelling at it, another at Fort Funston, where the dog did not back off after I told it to. I had to yell at it's owner, sitting some distance away - talking on her cell phone and not paying attention. She foolishly told me to just turn around and walk away from the dog. I did not feel comfortable turning my back on a threatening animal nor did I think it had more of a right to be there than I did. I had to keep "bothering" her until she finally came over and got the dog!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1165 **Comment Id:** 351807 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog owners should be willing to walk on leash in small parts of the area, but I am against off leash running of dogs in any of the region. The fire roads in the area are littered with waste and not fit for children to roam. Wildlife needs safe areas to be. I think we need to keep to a minimum the areas for dog use in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Organization:
Commenter: P. J Perring **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1174 **Comment Id:** 351909 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am so sick of dogs @ Rodeo Beach, Stinson Beach pissing on my lunch and fishing gear I have kind of given up fishing there. I reported to Rangers there and they don't seem interested. I have lived in Marin 75 years and I have never seen it this bad. Dog shit @ Stinson is terrible. People just leave it in the sand and kids play with it - so gross!
Organization:
Commenter: Mel Colombo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1187 **Comment Id:** 351948 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: For the past 35 years my wife and I have been regular visitors to Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. Recurring problems we are facing in these recreational areas are not properly controlled dogs (mostly of the recently sky-rocketing number of "dog-herders"). I am a disabled person suffering from limited peripheral vision and balance problems. Fast running (large) dogs ' in their excitement of being "let go" ' often brush me from their rear and even try to weasel through my legs causing me to lose balance. Through my limited vision I cannot detect them quickly enough to guard myself against unexpected collisions. At a height of 6'3" (and an age of 71) a loss of balance is a painful experience! When pointing out my dilemma to the dog owner (herder) more than once the response was "it's a dog park".
Organization:
Commenter: Christian Paech **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1225 **Comment Id:** 352023 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs present significant dangers to the wellbeing of the general public; dogs can and do attack and bite humans, espkecially children, women, and the elderly. Dog waste (feces) is dangerous to the health of humans, not to mention the damage to the environment.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1237 **Comment Id:** 352044 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need to run off-leash. Most weekends we get in a 3-4 mile run at Funston. This exercise is essential to the health and well being of my dogs as well as my health and well being. Walking calmly, on either end of a leash, down the street or through the park is not sufficient as a main source of exercise
Organization:

Commenter: Robert Molyneaux **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1267 **Comment Id:** 352196 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Six months ago I walked into my heart doctors office for an annual check-up and I had the best blood work numbers of my life. My doctor asked me what had changed and I told him that I had a new young energetic dog and that my dog and I had walked over 900 miles together over the previous year on different trails in Marin County. He congratulated me and told me that I could probably thank my dog for my better health since that was the reason I was getting out everyday.
Organization:
Commenter: Bob Wagner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1275 **Comment Id:** 352217 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My doctor has advised me that this type of steady pace walking is good exercise for my heart condition. Goldie's veterinarian also believes that daily walks in a place where she can socialize off leash with other dogs is also very good for her health. The Key Here is Recreation and they way you want to close off Fort Funston is not right and will ruin the quality of our Experience at Fort Funston
Organization: Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston
Commenter: Thomas E Roop **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1303 **Comment Id:** 352274 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Taking my dogs to the beach is my biggest passion. It is my hobby as well as my main means of exercise. I'm 47 and my doctor says that my dogs are keeping me in excellent health. My dogs are also emotionally and physically healthy from running off leash and socializing with other dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Marya Taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1304 **Comment Id:** 352277 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean beach and then all of the parks across the bridge is our daily past time and immensely increases the wellbeing of our own lives as well as that of our dog. We rescued a senior dog 2 years ago, and the first time we saw his depression lift was when we discovered how much he loved the waves at Chrissy field. Walking there and in the hills at Funston have without a doubt been the primary source of his healing and continues to be his main joy in life.
Organization:

Commenter: Tiffany A Wade **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1306 **Comment Id:** 352278 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean beach and then all of the parks across the bridge is our daily past time and immensely increases the wellbeing of our own lives as well as that of our dog. We rescued a senior dog 2 years ago, and the first time we saw his depression lift was when we discovered how much he loved the waves at Chrissy field. Walking there and in the hills at Funston have without a doubt been the primary source of his healing and continues to be his main joy in life. Walking around the neighborhood doesn't bring the same gleam to his eye, nor to ours.
Organization:
Commenter: James E Dewald **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1332 **Comment Id:** 352333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There is little if any enforcement of the leash law, dog walkers violate rules far more consistently than they follow them. The sense of entitlement among dog owners is truly stunning. I do not feel safe, nor do any of my friends with children.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1335 **Comment Id:** 352342 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This would be tragic. There are so few off leash dog areas left in an area FULL of dogs! Dogs extend and enhance the lives of humans. They make us happier and healthier. But they can only do this if they are happy and healthy themselves.
Organization:
Commenter: Cheryl N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1414 **Comment Id:** 352508 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dogs and I spend at least three days a week walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Fort Mason- an activity that is good for our mutual health and happiness.
Organization:
Commenter: Maya A De La Rosa-Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1419 **Comment Id:** 352517 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My 12-year-old daughter and I constantly marvel at the good fortune we have

to live near such a beautiful, hilly place, that allows us to get some real heart-pumping exercise and appreciate nature while we walk our dog. The GGNRA currently allows many kids and families a chance to get out in nature and exercise with their pets-an awesome way to ensure that children grow up with an appreciation for animals and nature and a healthy appetite for physical activity.

Organization:

Commenter: Kaitlin Quistgard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1428 **Comment Id:** 352534 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our favorite places are Crissy Field and Oakwood Valley. It's a great way for Lola to get her energy out and we both benefit from the fresh air and exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Wellington Sculley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1432 **Comment Id:** 352547 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Aside from that, it is annoying and dangerous whenever an unleashed dog sprints on to the busy bike/walking path nearly causing collisions with cyclists, pedestrians, strollers, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 635 **Comment Id:** 352785 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There is no evidence or data, however, that shows the current laws regarding dogs in the GGNRA are insufficient or that show dogs that use the GGNRA with owners who abide by existing regulations are a source of conflict, interfere with the use of the GGNRA by others, or destroy habitats or cultural resources.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee A Richards **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 654 **Comment Id:** 352831 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My daily off-leash walks with my dog, alternating between Land's End, Fort Funston and the Marin Headland Trails around Rodeo Beach are my exercise, my therapy, my church, my meditation, my vitamins. These easily accessed walks, keep me healthy, energized, and inspired.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1462 **Comment Id:** 352844 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is so much dog poop across the street, on Oakwood trail, on Miwok, almost anywhere we can walk to from our front door ... it's disgusting. I have two small children and I can't let them play in the woods across the street because it's so polluted and when we use the trails it's become a sick game to point out the piles of dog poop.

Organization:

Commenter: Arianna Orleans **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1472 **Comment Id:** 352859 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a resident of the outer sunset district in San Francisco and walk or run on Ocean Beach once or twice every day. In addition to the environmental concern about dogs disturbing birds, my primary concern is dogs which are not under the control of their owner. Frequently, my wife and I encounter threatening, totally out of control, dogs. Not only does this disrupt our sense of safety, but my wife has a very bad back and moving quickly to avoid an attack often results in additional injury to her back. I support requiring all dogs to be on leash at Ocean Beach.

Organization:

Commenter: Ian R Tuller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 666 **Comment Id:** 352862 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Your proposed restrictions to dog walking at Ft Funston and other areas within the GGNRA will greatly impact my life and the life of my dogs. It's the only place we can for daily exercise. We have been enjoying this park for 15 years and have been actively involved in the monthly clean ups. Having large dogs it is important for their mental and physical health to be able it runoff leash. We enjoy the acreage at Funston where there is enough space to interact with other dogs should we choose but most importantly we can enjoy walks alone and not have to feel like we are at a dog park. Please reconsider you plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura M Sweet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1497 **Comment Id:** 352919 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On this issue alone, without even considering the environmental degradation of 100's of dogs running in every direction leaving feces and especially repulsive dog feces bags everywhere, this rule is rarely abided by dog owners and I've never seen it enforced. This has lead me to experience deep fear, discomfort, and embarrassing moments when I should be in a hoped for peaceful, commune with nature. Instead dogs have chased me, attacked me, growled at me, bared their fangs at me - not just large canines but small nasty ones as well.

Organization:
Commenter: Marci V Scileppi **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1517 **Comment Id:** 352973 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This walk serves so many purposes for myself and others, it is good for my mental and physical health and the socialization for all of us has a positive affect that I'm sure ripples out into what has become an increasingly negative world.
Organization:
Commenter: Adrienne E Ames **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1541 **Comment Id:** 353042 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Taking my dog to Fort Funston and other such parks is so important to my mental and physical wellbeing. It is how my dog and I get our exercise, and seeing my dog run free brings me such joy.
Organization:
Commenter: Justin D Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1546 **Comment Id:** 353047 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking dogs has become a major source of employment in SF, and with 200k dogs in the city, this profession is guaranteed to increase....so having large open spaces for dogs to run and play offleash is crucial for the dogs exercise regimen and subsequentially their parents sanity
Organization:
Commenter: mike matusiak **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1579 **Comment Id:** 353144 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please reconsider the off leash ban in San Francisco locations. I currently walk my dog routinely at Fort Funston and always bring my toddler daughter with me. I have never once been concerned for the safety of my dog or daughter.
Organization:
Commenter: michael pattersom **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1606 **Comment Id:** 353185 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Likewise, I ask that there be increased monitoring and education around proper handling of dog waste. I see and smell piles of dog waste in every park I walk in, every single

time. At Crissy Field, the waste barrels are sometimes overflowing with bags of waste, and a pleasant walk along the waterfront is spoiled by the pervasive smell. Fort Funston reeks of dog urine on a warm day.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 823 **Comment Id:** 353358 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Countless studies have shown the immense physical and mental advantages of dog ownership.

Organization:

Commenter: Sherry Thomas-Healy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1661 **Comment Id:** 353493 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs and humans and children need to be offleash to be healthy and to be mentally in balance.

Organization:

Commenter: Cheis L Jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1663 **Comment Id:** 353497 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are part of Bay Area families. They get us outdoors, help keep us healthy, teach our children compassion and responsibility. There are too few pet friendly areas. I oppose the "Preferred Alternative"! I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristine Poggioli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1667 **Comment Id:** 353503 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: More and more it is being recognized how important pets, specifically dogs, are to one's mental well-being. Being able to allow these creatures to run and walk off-leash to get their exercise (and allow their owners to exercise) has benefits more far-reaching than colored trails on a big map.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa Brinkmann **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1669 **Comment Id:** 353516 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm a dog owner, walker and sitter in San Franicsco. I strongly oppose the proposed restrictions on off leash dog walking. Dogs are a part of the San Francisco fabric, and families, the elderly and young singles alike all enjoy the benefits of outdoor exercising with their dogs in areas where the dogs can trully romp and play.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Ceisel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1682 **Comment Id:** 353553 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Walking ones dog is a great form of exercise, especially for an aging human population. We dont jog and mountain bike forever! The demands of the dog for exercise, inspires the dogs caretaker to exercise too. This is of uncontested benefit to both the dog and human. Prohibiting leashed dogs on most of GGNRA trails just doesnt make sense, either from an ecological or health perspective.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1682 **Comment Id:** 353554 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Instances of dogs attacking people are VERY rare, even if dogs are not leashed. Unprovoked attacks on people by leashed dogs are probably nearly non-existent.

Organization:

Commenter: Patricia Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 898 **Comment Id:** 353612 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog feces are a public health hazard. Children playing on the beach are constantly exposed to this hazard. Owners do not clean up after their dogs and there is little or no enforcement.

Organization:

Commenter: Philip M Klasky **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1690 **Comment Id:** 353642 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off-leash in the GGNRA, Woody and I both derive the benefits of exercising, socializing, and getting in touch with nature. It is one of the most crucial pieces of the San Francisco lifestyle that I love so much.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1740 **Comment Id:** 353721 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For dog owners, the enjoyment of walking their dogs in the GGNRA, as well as offering them off leash access, is essential to the dog owners well being and health. I personally do not have a dog. However, my mother does and her taking her dog for walks in open spaces provides my mother an essential form of excersize that benefits her as well her dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen Johnston **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1741 **Comment Id:** 353723 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have lived in other cities and consider the lax dog rules in San Francisco to be unsafe and unfair. I feel unsafe around other people's off leash dogs and don't think my family should be forced to interact with other people's dogs when I go to a public park.

Organization:

Commenter: Holly Warren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1770 **Comment Id:** 353755 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Exercising her off leash, while respecting the beauty of these natural places, has made me a healthier and happier citizen, which I believe fulfills the purpose of setting aside such recreation areas in the first place.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1775 **Comment Id:** 353760 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a San Francisco resident with kids, I strongly support restricting dog access to the parks. Off-leash dogs can be dangerous - my wife has been bitten here in the city - and they make beaches and other park areas less usable for humans. I think dogs are wonderful, and this city has some fine dedicated dog parks. But people come first. Our parks need to be people-friendly first and foremost, and off-leash dogs degrade the quality for everyone else.

Organization:

Commenter: John Knapp **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1786 **Comment Id:** 353854 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not reduce the area available for dogs to be and be off leash in SF. Dogs are an incredibly positive factor in making SF special - and provide so many health benefits for the people who live here. Please AMEND or DO NOT PASS the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Draft Dog management Plan as it stands.

Organization:
Commenter: Anne E Moellering **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1791 **Comment Id:** 353869 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Although I know problems do occur, my observation is that they are very uncommon and it would be a huge shame to greatly curtail off-leash areas based on anecdotes. Part of living in a dense city environment is having to occasionally put up with people and situations (and yes, dogs) that you might prefer not to.
Organization:
Commenter: Jason Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1799 **Comment Id:** 354082 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please reserve an area for dog walking in all the different parks. As a woman, I always feel safer walking and hiking these areas with my dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Maria Tieu **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1800 **Comment Id:** 354093 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am absolutely in favor of tighter leash laws (but they need to be enforced) in addition to removing dog access all together. Dog waste has altogether become a problem everywhere. Streets, trails, beaches, you name it. Not to mention, where leashes are required, many owners do not adhere to the applicable laws. "Under voice control", unfortunately what dog owners deem as adequate voice control is open to interpretation, so much so its laughable and the only alternative is to ban them all together.
Organization:
Commenter: Shaun P Madden **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1814 **Comment Id:** 354138 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is incredibly important to both my health and the health of my dog to be able to exercise in our beautiful outdoor parks.
Organization:
Commenter: Page Bertelsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1819 **Comment Id:** 354143 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Last year I started a lifestyle change. I had gotten a puppy earlier in the year

and had to wait until it was safe for him to be on the streets. As soon as he was able, I started walking him. I walked and walked and walked him and you know happened? I lost 60 lbs! YEP! I went from Obese to 'Normal' and most of that change happened because I WALKED MY DOG!!

Organization:

Commenter: Francine P Pinoni **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1819 **Comment Id:** 354145 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a single female, I don't feel its safe to be on isolated trails alone (and its NOT!), but when I'm with Bubba, I'm all good!

Organization:

Commenter: Francine P Pinoni **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1827 **Comment Id:** 354269 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed revisions to dogs in park lands are too restrictive. It's important to retain our precious beaches and parks. It's also important to maintain the quality of life that provides a sense of community and positive health benefits for many who otherwise would not take part in the outdoors.

Organization:

Commenter: Penelope Douglas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1831 **Comment Id:** 354280 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please understand that this is a quality of life issue. Many of us spend several hours with our dogs at the beach, and other off-leash areas. We need the healthy atmosphere and exercise for our happiness and well being.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Ellis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1833 **Comment Id:** 354291 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A greater risk exists on the city streets than in parks. People don't take aggressive dogs to the beach, evidenced by the relatively few reported incidents of dog bites (only 9 bites in 17 million visits to the parks last year, according to Parks Services' own report).

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 1835 **Comment Id:** 354309 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Fort Funston area is a key place and one of only a few I know of where dogs can be dogs - off leash. They can run on the beach, interact with other dogs, and feel free for a time. It is truly a sight to see your dog as happy as a dog can be, and currently they can be that at Fort Funston. This also keeps their owners fit and healthy, happy and calm. With what dogs face these days, so many being euthanized that don't have the luxury of homes and owners that care, let's not take one more thing away from them.

Organization:

Commenter: Nathan L Hanley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1839 **Comment Id:** 354332 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As frequent visitors to GGNRA sites, we are alarmed by the number of dog owners who let their uncontrolled dogs run off-leash. Many of them are not under voice control. Those of us who have been attacked and bitten by dogs and/or feel very uncomfortable around unleashed dogs are labeled as unreasonable when we ask that owners to leash their uncontrollable dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1843 **Comment Id:** 354337 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Thank you for finally establishing some controls and limits around dogs running wild in our parks. I have a small child and he has been knocked down and traumatized by dogs that roam without leashes or any control by their owners. When it's gotten to the point where it's not safe for children to play in parks because of fear of being attacked, a change has to be made.

Organization:

Commenter: Eric Sugar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1848 **Comment Id:** 354347 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly agree with the idea of this plan. However, from what I can see, there is no mention of Stern Grove Park anywhere. I live in the area, and I cannot take my kid to Stern Grove, because, despite the fact that this park has its own dog play area, the off-leash dogs are everywhere - kids playground included. This is not safe. My concern is that after the other city parks become more restricted towards the off-leash dogs, there would be even more off-leash dogs in Stern Grove, which would basically turn it into one huge dog park, neighborhood children be damned. So my suggestion is to try to make off-leash/on-leash restrictions and clear markings a citywide project, to save other parks, and especially Stern Grove, from becoming exclusively dogs playgrounds.

Organization:

Commenter: Maria Belilovskaya **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1853 **Comment Id:** 354377 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am pleased to see this new expansion to keep dogs out of the park. I go to Crissy Field frequently with my child. We have been jumped on by off-leash dogs, a dog once peed on our beach bad, and there is always dog poop on the ground. Dog owners always apologize and say "my dog is friendly." They seem to not care that not everyone likes dogs and many of us do not want to pet their dogs not be tackled by them. They don't care that children might be afraid of a dog bounding up to them and knocking them off their feet.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1913 **Comment Id:** 354533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog owners also add to the safety of the region - especially for women who walk alone.
Organization:
Commenter: dee clark **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2014 **Comment Id:** 354685 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: If pet waste is an issue, allocating more areas for people to throw pet waste away can solve this problem.
Organization:
Commenter: Jacob M Aringo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2656 **Comment Id:** 354798 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are very few episodes of dog aggression on the current off leash areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia Dailey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2875 **Comment Id:** 354888 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I walk for health reasons (panic attacks are lessened by walking each day) and as a single woman I rely on the security I have with my dog at my side.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: sharon kizziah **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2914 **Comment Id:** 355207 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the residents of San Francisco and other bay area cities need open spaces to walk their dogs off leash contributing to better physical and mental health for all. This will result in healthier, happier cities.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Bonnie Kuczborski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2924 **Comment Id:** 355216 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Mental and physical health requires being able to run and play for all creatures. I have walked me dog in SF for years and the only trouble I ever had was when a pit bull escaped their house and attacked my dog on the sidewalk. Make it a requirement that only socialized dogs can run free if you must make new rules.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Louisa Suta **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2936 **Comment Id:** 355239 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Living in a high density city it's necessary for our mental health to enjoy the beaches and nature with my dog.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: judith calson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2943 **Comment Id:** 355249 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Pet atracks are exceedingly rare

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Rowan paul **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3004 **Comment Id:** 355344 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Aside from that, I firmly believe that owning a dog promotes a healthy lifestyle, getting people out of their homes and spending time outdoors. There are already too many areas that forbid dogs, and a lot of those areas go unused.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Stephen Poulios **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3008 **Comment Id:** 355350 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In all my visits to the beach, I have never seen any problem interactions between the dogs, nor threatening/harmful behavior towards other humans. In my experience, dogs are allowed off leash in many other beaches and natural areas throughout the state - why should these be different?

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Stephanie Flores **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3026 **Comment Id:** 355377 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog goes every day to enjoy one of the GGNRA parks and needs this to promote a healthy life. Offering these areas for pets promotes a healthy lifestyle for myself, my family, and my dog and allows us to get out to enjoy the preserved nature that surrounds San Francisco.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: jennifer ho **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3130 **Comment Id:** 355391 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The dog-friendly off-leash areas in and around San Francisco are very valuable and widely used. Please do not shut them down! I'm not even a dog owner and I enjoy going to these locations with friends and their dogs! It's crucial for my friends' health and the health of their animals to get this fresh air and exercise while living in such a dense urban environment.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Carly Jefferson-Dow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3647 **Comment Id:** 355392 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the health and wellbeing of countless dog owners and their dogs depend on these places for exercise, socialization, and exquisite recreation.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: molly mitchell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3739 **Comment Id:** 355611 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is cruel to keep dogs in apartments and on leash their entire lives!!! People and pets which make us happy, healthy, productive and responsible should live in harmony!

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Christine Federico **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3896 **Comment Id:** 355646 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because as long as your a responsible pet owner you should be able to enjoy the park with your dog. Dogs can save lives when no one else is around
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: janet Rosillo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3903 **Comment Id:** 355654 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because countless people who use and enjoy the parks do so precisely because they can let their dogs run freely there. This makes for a healthier com munity as people get exercise with their dogs.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Amey Garber **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4191 **Comment Id:** 355962 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We need to promote pet ownership for our mental and physical health, especially those of us living in cities. Dogs, in particular, promote our physical health by taking us for frequent walks. But a dog really cannot get enough exercise to be healthy if it is at the end of a tether.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Timothy Covington **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4198 **Comment Id:** 355974 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because having open areas for dogs improves the health of owners and canines as well as reducing behavior problems through exercise and support from other experienced dog owners. On any given day there is a com munity of many dozens of people available for friendship and exchange of knowledge. Urban dog parks don't offer the space or exercise opportunities available here.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Katrina Wreede **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4454 **Comment Id:** 355989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because. Dogs and humans need exercise. Its just a few people who oppose dogs. And just very small minority of dog owners who cause some trouble. Please don't restrict our lives any further than it is already.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Caspar Willems **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4458 **Comment Id:** 355994 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Personally, I take my dog every weekend to Ft. Funston. It's good for him because he expends energy and socializes with other dogs and people. It's good for me because I exercise and unwind.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Melanie Rafaty **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5365 **Comment Id:** 356025 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because we were at Ft. Funston Saturday with 2 families and 5 kids and 2 dogs. We wouldn't have been there if it weren't for the dogs because they need to get out every day. But we adults need to get out too. The kids definitely need to get out or they'd be inside and play video games. It benefits us all.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Bradley Charbonneau **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2621 **Comment Id:** 356915 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Moreover, Fort Funston was littered with dog feces and dog walkers who could not "voice control" the 10-15 dogs they would walk at one time. This is a safety hazard for anyone who is trying to enjoy a park and doesn't want to play with dogs and/or has an allergy or intense fear of them.

Organization:

Commenter: Thea Zajac **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2635 **Comment Id:** 356939 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Single women feel safer hiking with a canine companion and dogs get the elderly out of the house socializing on trails.

Organization:

Commenter: Betsy DeFries **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2638 **Comment Id:** 356958 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Pet ownership and dog companions are a tremendous necessity for human and therefor community health in urban environments. This plan undermines the natural and fundamental needs people have for pet companionship.
Organization: DotGreen Foundation
Commenter: Annalisa M Roger **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2644 **Comment Id:** 356981 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Ft Funston is a lovely place BECAUSE of the dogs there, not in spite of them. This cold, foggy, windy place would see few visitors w/out the dog users and many women who run there on weekend mornings do so because of the SAFETY that comes with dog users out and about.
Organization:
Commenter: Lori Redford **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2649 **Comment Id:** 356989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: A huge percentage of people who live in this area have dogs and derive a great deal of health, happiness and well being from being able to enjoy nature with them. Isn't this the purpose of a recreation area?
Organization:
Commenter: Tracy Barsotti **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2664 **Comment Id:** 357009 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We absolutely need space in our vast outdoors for us to walk with our pets. It is the safest place for both to walk and pets are proven to improve the health and wellness of all who they interact with, so this is a public health and wellness issue.
Organization:
Commenter: Jenny P Terry **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2673 **Comment Id:** 357033 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a senior citizen who does not have a dog but I go to Fort Funston every morning and I can tell you that offleash dogs are not a problem out there. People walking their dogs make the park safer for everyone because they are out 24/7, rain or shine.

Organization:
Commenter: Margaret Best **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2680 **Comment Id:** 357046 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My mother is 84 years old. Walking her dogs after her stroke and the death of her husband is what has kept her healthy and fit.
Organization:
Commenter: D. Wardell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2686 **Comment Id:** 357059 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We exercise in these areas with our dog off leash and under voice control for both our own health as well as the health of our dog.
Organization:
Commenter: Angela Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2703 **Comment Id:** 357115 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Every Saturday and Sunday of each week I take my dog PJ to Chrissy field to run, swim and play with me and other dogs and get good and tired to boot. I feel that these outings are as beneficial to him as they are me.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa J Davidson Wissink **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2706 **Comment Id:** 357119 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It also means that every time I am out enjoying nature, I expect to be pounced on by an unleashed bounding dog. Big and small- -dogs act as if they can do whatever they want. Even if leashed, the handler seems to assume their dog is harmless. Or I hear the familiar words, "don't worry, he won't bite, he's friendly." That time, when the handler tried to call his dog back, that bull terrier ignored him and jumped on me- -twice! So much for voice control. How on earth am I supposed to act normal (and not scared) when I am absolutely petrified that I will get bitten? Whenever I go for a jog in the GGNRA, I know I will have to stop in my tracks and walk quietly and carefully past every dog so as to avoid him/her growling or chasing me because I am jogging.
Organization:
Commenter: Helen D Gonzales **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2706 **Comment Id:** 357120 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Okay, so the mindful handlers always clean up after their pets. So why is there so much poop fouling the beaches and our shoes. Not so much fun for families when they are out enjoying the great outdoors. I see parents/nannies with toddlers on the shore at Crissy Field and some are on constant alert because of the many unleashed dogs cavorting nearby. Cannot even sit on the grass without worrying about some sort of residue left over from Fido.

Organization:

Commenter: Helen D Gonzales **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2707 **Comment Id:** 357121 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please, we love running on the beach.....it is healthy for our minds and bodies....my old bones can't take hard impact and sand is forgiving....wouldn't be the same without my companions.

Organization:

Commenter: laura scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2771 **Comment Id:** 357422 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When I adopted my dog from the San Francisco SPCA, I made a commitment to provide a better life for him. Crucial to this is being able to give him adequate exercise and play in the areas where I live. This exercise is also important in increasing the health and well being of dog owners themselves.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2814 **Comment Id:** 357545 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having a dog that is able to run freely in off leash areas is important to me in that it makes me happy as well! I have a stressful job and seeing my dog run and play off leash is important to my mental health and it allows me to function in a high stress work environment. Please do not take away our off leash areas!

Organization:

Commenter: Ralph A Patricelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2835 **Comment Id:** 357591 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep Ft. Funston and at least some other of the current "doggie beaches" leash free. For the many, many dog owners in San Francisco and the surrounding area, the opportunity to run on the beach and hike in the hills with our canine companions is an important recreational/health-maintenance activity.

Organization:
Commenter: Sara McAulay **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2851 **Comment Id:** 357631 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: For reasons of public safety, health, and the environment there should be very limited off-leash space in the City and San francisco should comply with national policies in our national parks.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2876 **Comment Id:** 357707 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking my dog in the GGNRC is healthy not only for me, but also my dog. I have never had a problem in doing so.
Organization:
Commenter: Alex Milo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3029 **Comment Id:** 357723 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I became a dog owner after recovering from cancer treatment at age 28. The healing that has taken place after just a few months of walking/running/fetching with my beloved dog Sal along crissy feld, fort funston and ocean beach has been absolutely extraordinary.
Organization:
Commenter: molly c mitchell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3039 **Comment Id:** 357757 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash dog sites such as Fort Funston and Chrissy Fields keep BOTH dogs and humans healthy and happy. There has to be a better way.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3043 **Comment Id:** 357760 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a city of many dog owners, one of the major factors that contributes to the health of the individuals who live here is dog ownership. And one of the driving factors behind dog ownership is the ability to easily and enjoyably exercise our canine companions
Organization:
Commenter: Joel C Philpot **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3050 **Comment Id:** 357791 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs are an integral part of my life and I wouldnt get any exercise if it wasnt for my dog. They (he) is literally a life saver and has helped me through many difficult circumstances including the death of both my parents and my best friend over the last 5 years.
Organization:
Commenter: Andrew Narraway **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3059 **Comment Id:** 357842 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I hike with my dog off-leash 3 to 4 times a week. It is necessary to keep me healthy in body and spirit.
Organization:
Commenter: Emily Coon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3060 **Comment Id:** 357845 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: To be healthy, dogs need to be able to exercise freely in open space. The need to be able to run, which requires off leash space. This is a quality of life issue for the dogs, but also for human SF residents who own dogs. Off leash park areas are a necessity for the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: Cassandra E Fritzen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3066 **Comment Id:** 357869 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a city full of dogs and small apartments, these outdoor areas as key. I strongly support alternatives to closing the areas for off-leash dogs as it's vital asset to both the dogs and human owners quality of life.
Organization:
Commenter: Taylor Reid **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3067 **Comment Id:** 357873 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The Draft Dog Management Plan excessively restricts off-leash areas in San Francisco and would seriously reduce our quality of life in San Francisco.
Organization:
Commenter: Charlie Rauseo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3078 **Comment Id:** 357887 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs, especially urban dogs, need these areas for exercise and recreation. These areas are vital to dogs that tend to live in small areas with small or worse, no yards. Pet owners who do not have yards, which is commonplace in cities like San Francisco, rely on these areas to exercise their pets. Without them, we have a serious quality of life issue for the humans and dogs in this equation.

Organization:

Commenter: Monica H **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3136 **Comment Id:** 357923 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: PLEASE don't limit dog off leash places (even more than how terrible it is now) for dogsand seriously spend a little more time to accommodate the MANY tax payers that hope for more places to let their dogs loose for better mental and physical health!

Organization:

Commenter: niloofar ehsani **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3195 **Comment Id:** 357963 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash areas are also a decompression time for me. Living in the city is hard! There are lots of intense things to deal with, like traffic, homelessness, litter, high cost of living, large amount of houses/people pre sq. mile etc. bBeing able to play with my dog outside in nature and connect with other humans during the process is vital for my survival as a woman, mother, wife, god owner and citizen of San Francisco

Organization:

Commenter: Summer N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3207 **Comment Id:** 357971 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not limit or further restrict access for the community and their dogs to the GGNRA. These areas in SF, Marin and San Mateo counties are important places for residents and their dogs. Because of the urban setting we live in, having these areas open for people and dogs to exercise in and enjoy is CRITICAL !!!

Organization:

Commenter: Craig Jory **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3222 **Comment Id:** 357993 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Running, walking, and hiking together in the open air with our dogs boosts the body, the heart and the soul of us both - keeping both dog and human healthy. It is so very important for us, and even more important for our animals! Enclosed urban dog parks and leash-

only areas are simply no replacement for open beaches and parklands where owner and pet can run freely.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3222 **Comment Id:** 357995 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For many years, my husband battled cancer. When he felt well enough, our dog would get him up and out for a walk in nature. As his caregiver, I relied on our dog - a border collie - to maintain my own health and strength, with daily invigorating hikes in the trails, walks on the open paths, and/or runs on the beach. Without her and our walks in the parks, I dont know how I would have made it through those difficult days. Working out in a gym is simply no replacement for running on open trails with ones dog.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3238 **Comment Id:** 358011 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Xavier Brouard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3353 **Comment Id:** 358221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs should be leased in marked areas. Many dog walkers pay no attention to signs or keeping their dogs on a lease and under control. I am often blocked by dogs that jump up on me. As a 78 year old, this is a constant hazard.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy B Kenyon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3356 **Comment Id:** 358227 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I also worry about dogs jumping on the boys or even attacked by unleashed dogs.I have been attacked by unleashed dogs, bitten by a few, and often with the owner saying "oh he's friendly."

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3378 **Comment Id:** 358291 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a woman, I would not feel safe hiking trails without the protection of my dog.
Organization:
Commenter: pam herz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3390 **Comment Id:** 358311 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs do more than just scare away wildlife, they kill wildlife, their owners neglect to clean up properly after them which creates a dirty smelly environment, which also can spread disease. Dogs can be aggressive to children as well and may fight with eachother. In general they disturb the peaceful quiet use of the GGNRA and threaten the very wildlife we go there to enjoy
Organization: Ms.
Commenter: laura woodford **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3546 **Comment Id:** 359177 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Those dogs bring joy, love, comfort, therapy, community, tolerance, and health benefits to hundreds of thousands of people.
Organization:
Commenter: Triston McLaughlin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3621 **Comment Id:** 359262 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There also have been conflicts of dogs with horses in several places. There also have been many serious incidents annually requiring U.S. Park Police intervention or ranger rescue of dogs and sometimes owners from cliffs and other dangerous places.
Organization:
Commenter: Amy W Meyer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3780 **Comment Id:** 359600 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On multiple occasions we have witnessed and/or experienced the following at specific GGNRA areas: " Children under two years of age, including our own children, being knocked down by unsupervised/unleashed running larger dogs at Crissy Field East Beach. " Leashed/unleashed dogs in areas where dogs are prohibited, particularly Tennessee Valley Trail and Tennessee Beach. " Bagged and un-bagged, dog waste left on the beaches, trails, sidewalks,

and lawns at all of the above areas. One of the worst areas is Oakwood Valley Trail where dog owners seem to mock the rules by consistently abandoning bagged feces along the trails

Organization:

Commenter: Lex F. and Bobbi Lynn Campbell and Jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3942 **Comment Id:** 360108 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: we should be encouraging pet ownership which promotes urban resident psychoological and physical health. In particular, dogs are required to take their owners on frequent walks. Please do it also for the health of the dogs which cannot get the exercise they need at the end of a tether.

Organization:

Commenter: Timothy A Covington **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3948 **Comment Id:** 360113 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And think about health expenses reduction for all those for whom dogs provide companionship and ability to be in better mood/be less depressed. Being with dogs is therapeutic. In the end, we all benefit from having happier, healthier folks around, and from fewer psychosomatic visits to primary care doctors.

Organization:

Commenter: Natalya Golovanov **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3966 **Comment Id:** 360232 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a woman, I am far more comfortable hiking with my dog. He makes me feel safe. And he also needs off-leash areas in which to run. Have you ever tried to play fetch with a dog on leash? It doesn't work.

Organization:

Commenter: anne c harper **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3993 **Comment Id:** 360381 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is vitally important for the health of the community to have off-leash dog areas. Both non-dog owners as well as dog owners benefit from having healthy dogs who are well socialized in the community.

Organization:

Commenter: Dori Melton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA161531

Correspondence Id: 4531 **Comment Id:** 360485 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRAs original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan fails to do.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Cone **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4546 **Comment Id:** 360531 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On a personal note, I am 63 years old and fighting a fierce battle with stage IV cancer. There is no doubt in my mind that the reason I have done as well as I have in the last year is in very large measure because of the frequent hikes I have been able to take at Fort Funston with my well behaved off-leash dog and the ability to interact with the extraordinary community there.

Organization:

Commenter: Vicki B Tiernan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4550 **Comment Id:** 360578 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Part of the appeal to living in California and San Francisco is the access to parks and the beach. Being able to take my dogs out and get regular exercise benefits both my physical and mental health. It is greatly discouraging to have felt that all talks and negotiations were completely disregarded when this new draft was put forward with very few changes in place.

Organization:

Commenter: Dusty Lombardo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4555 **Comment Id:** 360604 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4569 **Comment Id:** 360647 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have lived with wonderful rescued German Shepherds for much of that time;

they have been socialized and active dogs who loved meeting other dogs and running and playing off-leash. Doing so kept them, and me, healthy and happy.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Eason **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361118 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS data still doesnt support claims that there are major safety problems associated with dogs that require off-leash restrictions. In fact, according to GGNRA data collected between 2001 and 2006, incidence reports that involved dogs (7%) d in comparison with the majority of problems, which involved people (93%).k personnel and resources required by visitors for instances of injuries, fatalities, rescues and missing persons far outnumbered the same situations for dogs. In other words, millions of dogs visit the GGNRA every year and the problems associated with them are miniscule at best.

Organization:

Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4600 **Comment Id:** 361126 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a senior and I get my exercise walking my dog. It is important for seniors (and everyone) to have public spaces in which to exercise and build community relationships. Living in a dog-friendly region such as the Bay Area adds greatly to my quality of life and losing access to areas that I have always enjoyed fills my heart with grief.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4611 **Comment Id:** 361135 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my experience, I have not seen dogs fight with each other. I see happy dogs that run to their heart's content until they are tired. I see people enjoying each other as they share things about their animals. I have a history of depression. Dogs provide unconditional love when I see dogs running free, I feel peace, contentment, and joy. The interaction between humans and their animals projects happiness.

Organization:

Commenter: Virginia M Currie **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4620 **Comment Id:** 361140 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I strongly support the few remaining off leash parks in and around San Francisco. Our family dog is an important part of our lives and we all benefit by being able to walk her off leash in the parks. It makes us all healthier, mentally and physically.

Organization:
Commenter: Tia K Pierce **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4644 **Comment Id:** 361173 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Further, I am concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported: 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.
Organization:
Commenter: John Delaplane **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4669 **Comment Id:** 361294 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Many women do not feel safe on trail alone, even in Marin. Dogs allow them to enjoy places they would not otherwise be able to see, and solitude they would not otherwise be able to have. Dogs are vital part of our society.
Organization:
Commenter: Noah Austin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4675 **Comment Id:** 361314 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The benefits I derive from off-leash is the following: 1. Allows me to get full exercise by either running or climbing, with my dog getting adequate exercise to. With a dog on leash, these exercises are seriously diminished. 2. seeing my dog and other dogs being able to play and be one with nature is is incredibly joyful. 3. Being able to have my dog off leash brings about a sense of freedom, and harmony with nature, which is one of the reasons that I moved to the Bay Area.
Organization:
Commenter: Alexandra Willson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4689 **Comment Id:** 361339 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In addition, data shows dogs are not causing problems at the parks. Last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:
Commenter: Siobhan Quinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4693 **Comment Id:** 361342 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We have nearly fallen and been injured several times while running on the dirt path that goes from Crissy Field to Fort Point. The path gets very busy on nice days and on weekends, and off leash dogs dart and make dangerous sudden, unpredictable moves causing runners to risk injury to stop short or avoid a collision. I have also witnessed several dog fights. For the safety of all, it is my hope that does would be required to be on-leash on the path, and perhaps keep the large field off-leash.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4711 **Comment Id:** 361368 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please don't restrict lease free zones. Dogs and people have co-existed for 50k years and they bring amazing mental and recently discover health benefits to their owners and children. Help San Francisco be the progressive place that it is an offer options for on lease and off lease.
Organization:
Commenter: Adam D Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4732 **Comment Id:** 361407 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a resident of San Francisco, and I am constantly worried about being bitten by off-leash dogs when I go to parks. In my experience, if there is one off-leash area, the vast majority of dog owners treat the entire park as an off-leash area.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4742 **Comment Id:** 361420 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: He gets lots of on leash walking but it is the running that he needs and we need to keep Ocean Beach and Fort Funston open for Tucker and all his other dog friends and all their people that go with them. There is too much 'fatness' in America. We all need places to go that help us stay healthy. Every body needs a workout and it would be a shame and unAmerican to close off these perfect places for dogs and their humans to exercise, be outside and enjoy the beauty and uniqueness our very special corner of California.
Organization: Private Citizen
Commenter: Marta Lutz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4774 **Comment Id:** 361493 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are proven to support mental health and workplace productivity. Off-leash areas are absolutely essential for the health of these dogs. For the love of all the hardworking, super smart, productive people and canines of the San Francisco Bay Area, we MUST preserve off-leash access. Any move to restrict off-leash access will likely be met with unnecessary and politically costly hostility.

Organization:

Commenter: Kristen Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4781 **Comment Id:** 361519 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Lastly, the most recent data that was released by the GGNRA (in 2013) shows that in the last year, out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people who own dogs, there have only been 6 reported dog bites; 5 reported dog fights; 2 cliff rescues; 2 reported cases where people were "scared" by a dog; 1 instance of a wildlife killing; and 1 horse bite incident. Reported incidents involving people are much higher than any statistic involving an incident with a dog. This data, released by the GGNRA, does not support the argument that there is a need for major change. This data also does not support the request for more rangers, which would cost another $2MM per year

Organization:

Commenter: Katherine Palmisano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4791 **Comment Id:** 361542 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA's mission is to provide access to nature for residents of an urban area. It's an essential mission - having open places that urban residents and visitors can enjoy and to foster taking care of our natural environment. AND, it's a fact that urban dwellers have pets who bring joy and companionship into their lives. These pets deserve space to enjoy fresh air and exercise. These elements are important components to good health and disposition.

Organization: retired

Commenter: Ann Sasaki **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4792 **Comment Id:** 361544 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our daily off leash dog walks are the single most important component to my husband's and my daily exercise.

Organization: MDG

Commenter: Margaret P Kritzer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4797 **Comment Id:** 361555 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing in opposition to the Preferred Alternative. This plan is too restrictive. The GGNRA should be an area for all to enjoy equally. Taking away off leash areas and creating this limited access is unfair. I walk my dog off leash at Fort Funston and it is good for my health as well as my dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Phillip R Benedetti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4808 **Comment Id:** 361573 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The second large problem with allowing domesticated dogs to roam free concerns the unfortunate ability of the dog to drop a load of waste at almost any given moment. These dropping (feces) carry nasty pathogen and viruses that can be transmitted to wildlife and humans simply by coming in contact with the dropping. It matters little if the droppings are 'picked up' or not. The residue does remain and presents the possibility of human or wildlife contact.

Organization: Audubon Society-Marin County

Commenter: Richard A Fraites **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4815 **Comment Id:** 361579 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization: San Francisco citizen and dog owner

Commenter: Felicia J Zeiger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4816 **Comment Id:** 361582 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Theres an epidemic of obesity and other health problems in this country, many of which can be traced to a lack of exercise - recent studies indicate dog owners may get as much as 34% mre exercise than non-owners.. As a dog-owner yourself (are you still?), Im sure you understand how important owning a dog can be in addressing this issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Judith D Kucera **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4825 **Comment Id:** 361604 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Recreating with a dog is a common and healthy practice. It lifts our spirits and gets us out into the fresh air. Some people, especially the elderly, would not make the effort to go outside for a walk on a daily basis if not for the desire to take their best friend out for some necessary exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: Marla Miyashiro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4840 **Comment Id:** 361620 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The notion that $2,000,000 will need to be allocated for more rangers is not supported by the data. The numbers released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4857 **Comment Id:** 361640 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have never seen someone not picking up after their dog and think it's a travesty that you would remove these areas for dogs to run and play. Owning a dog leads to a healthier and happier life which has been proven through several research studies and in this day and age that is great to have.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4873 **Comment Id:** 361673 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There are already so many people needing a place to hang out with their doggy besties, where on good days it is already almost near impossible to find parking and access, limiting the amount of area we have by a staggering 75% rally is cruelty and neglect for these animals, as well as their owners. I honestly believe that having these quality off leash areas promote healthy ownership of animals.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4907 **Comment Id:** 361761 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I use the GGNRA parkland at both Crissy Field and Fort Funston with my dog

regularly, and I am extremely upset by and strongly opposed to the preferred alternative described in the new draft dog management plan. It's way too restrictive, and will inhibit my ability to use this land to support mine and my dog's health and well-being as I have for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Barry R Perlman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4918 **Comment Id:** 361772 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a divorced woman I feel secure while walking with my dogs, and it is part of their joy to have time off leash. They are always within my voice control range.

Organization:

Commenter: Elia Haworth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4957 **Comment Id:** 361836 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A large portion of people and their dogs in the area use these parks to exercise their dogs, which in turns helps reduce destructive and aggressive tendencies in some dogs when properly exercised. I have never felt threatened or in danger at the dog park from a dog owner or their dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen K **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4963 **Comment Id:** 361856 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not only do my dogs need to run, I need to walk, being ridden with rheumatoid arthritis. Moving, walking allows me to be functional, working and out of pain. I remain in San Francisco because of all the gorgeous areas in which I am able to walk and my dogs run. PLEASE do not take away this from me and all the MANY dog owners and dogs (still more dogs per capita than anywhere else in the nation, I believe!).

Organization:

Commenter: Laura J Small **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5011 **Comment Id:** 361999 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We walk our dog (a Border Collie Mix) every day on the trails of Marin. This keeps us all both mentally & physically fit and is an important part of our daily routine.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa D **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5019 **Comment Id:** 362014 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog and family in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. This plan is very restrictive and will prevent me and my family from using the RECREATIONAL spaces with our dog in a way that supports our health and the health of our dog.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5045 **Comment Id:** 362109 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep our off leash dog areas! Our family relies on these parks for outings together, and we love being able to run around with kids and dogs together. It's great exercise for everyone!

Organization:

Commenter: Lauren E N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5050 **Comment Id:** 362119 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Most of the people with dogs have a special appreciation for the outdoors and tend to stay healthy physically and mentally; scientific studies back up the wonderful relationships between people and their pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer J Olson Spindell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5067 **Comment Id:** 362149 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our family has lived near the trailhead since 1999, and my wife has never felt safe to walk the trail either alone or with our two young children. There are just too many dog walkers (including professionals), who let their dogs off leash. I have been bitten while jogging the trail, and I can attest to feeling fear every time I am approached by a random dog there.

Organization:

Commenter: David S Swope **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5103 **Comment Id:** 362182 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I walk my dog regularly off leash via voice command in the GGNRA and I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft Dog Management Plan. For me, this plan is too restrictive and will prevent me from exercising with my dog, impacting not only my health, but the health of my dog.

Organization:
Commenter: Amy Puffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5132 **Comment Id:** 362260 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: \We both get so much exercise, and I find it to be a terrific stress reducer at the end of a work week. I have met more than one new friend while dog walking at Fort Funston, and having such a tremendous off-leash resource is a jewel in the city's crown.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher Fleitas **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5155 **Comment Id:** 362291 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs keep people healthy. They get people out walking and exercising in other ways too, and going to undeveloped areas with fresh air keeps the dogs keeping their people healthy.
Organization:
Commenter: Jewel L Rose **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4260 **Comment Id:** 362328 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The most recent data released by the GGNRA (2013) does not support the statement in the plan that says dogs cause major safety problems. In fact, during 2013 there were only 6 reported dog bites, 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 1 wildlife killing, 1 horse bite and 2 complaints where people were scared. This data does not support the need for more restrictions on dogs and certainly doesn't justify an additional $2 million per year for rangers.
Organization:
Commenter: Joanne A Scott **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5177 **Comment Id:** 362451 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I live by 8th ave and Balbao ave in Inner Richmond and am 2 blocks from Golden Gate Park, where I frequent on a daily basis with my pet where I either a) run through the park with him, as well as play Frisbee/fetch. Not only do I get great exercise for both myself and my dog, but this is usually one of the highlights of my day.
Organization:
Commenter: Angeline Yap **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5181 **Comment Id:** 362504 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog waste is not environmentally friendly and can be classified as a health hazard even if it deposited in trash cans it still must be handled and removed safely from the area placing the additional burden of cost to the tax payer who might have a different opinion of dogs or animals; think and practice leave no trace in our natural public lands. Dog and animal owners should remove and pack out all waste on their own to include supplying and removing dog fecal matter disposal bags.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5185 **Comment Id:** 362523 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I make extensive use of GGNRA lands, especially in Marin County. Walking is an essential part of both my dog's health and my own. Off-leash exercise is critical to my dog's health and happiness.

Organization:

Commenter: Stephen Gimber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5188 **Comment Id:** 362544 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have lived here and enjoyed walking in the GGNRA for 18 years, and I depend on these walks to keep fit and active. My dogs have kept me company and motivated to walk daily for the last 16 years.

Organization:

Commenter: Alice A Gleghorn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5190 **Comment Id:** 362549 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog walkers are the most frequent users of the beaches in all types of weather and thereby make it safer for others due to their constant presence.

Organization:

Commenter: Brian Kerester **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5221 **Comment Id:** 362636 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I hike alone, for exercise before work, and take my dog along for my own safety and security. We walk from our house, along the beach and up the Coastal Fire Road to the Coastal Trail and then back to my office in Muir Beach. If we have time, we go to Pirate's Cove. I would never be comfortable taking this hike alone if not for my dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura L Pandapas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5224 **Comment Id:** 362687 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Without off-leash recreation, I probably wouldn't have visited these parks more than 3-4 times a year. The opportunity to walk and enjoy nature with my dog is keeping this senior citizen fit and socially connected hundreds of other people who come to the park for off-leash recreation.
Organization:
Commenter: K Hu **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5262 **Comment Id:** 362830 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I feel safer when I can hike, bike, exercise in the company of my dog. Women are unfortunately vulnerable on the trail. Within the time I have lived in southern Marin women have been attacked on trails near my home.
Organization:
Commenter: Colleen Lenihan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5278 **Comment Id:** 362866 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Over the years, the benefits of the off-leash recreation areas have been clearly demonstrated, not only in terms of health benefits, but also by the harder-to-measure value added in terms of the cultural richness of the area. Bay area pet owners often cite the dog-friendliness as one of the most-valued attributes of the bay area's offerings.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5287 **Comment Id:** 362885 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My experience as a San Francisco resident is with Fort Funston. It is a great place and it is one of the first places new residents discover if they have a dog. It is a place where I have met people who I ended up dog sitting for. It is a community. I feel safe there walking alone. I feel safer there than in my own neighborhood.
Organization:
Commenter: Carola Hamann **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5299 **Comment Id:** 362916 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Off leash walking is extremely beneficial for both pet owner and pet alike. It provides a sense of freedom that is not attainable on city streets or many of the other existing

parks in San Francisco. For me personally, it provides my primary source of exercise on a daily basis to hike at Fort Funston with my dogs. There are hundreds of people and their pets that will be displaced from an activity that is and should be available to them. Please consider the impact that it will have on the current and future dog owners as well as the neigbhorhoods and city parks that will see a large increase in dog activity.

Organization:

Commenter: Adam Damico **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5307 **Comment Id:** 362939 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Once there, Yoki gets to run freely under my voice control with her dog friends. It is so good for her health and for mine. She is a happy dog because she is able to run and play, then come back to me. And I am her happy human companion being witness to her pure joy. This off-leash freedom is something I can give her when she gives me so much every day. Without a large off-leash open area like Fort Funston I would not be able to allow my dog this kind of play time pleasure. Due to my illness I am not able to run with her to keep her exercised. So the off-leash freedom to run at Fort Funston in a safe area with other dogs is a godsend to my current life situation.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan L Damron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5309 **Comment Id:** 362947 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We need to preserve off leash recreation for the health and well being of our pets. This in turn will promote the health and well being of our citizenry as we can exercise ourselves as well as our pets. Restricting off leash areas is dangerous for all pf us as we all become less able to properly exercise our bodies along with our canine companions.

Organization:

Commenter: Marilyn Harrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5315 **Comment Id:** 362959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However I'm more concern with the dog feces left on sidewalks all over San Francisco, dog owners should have serious fines to discourage these areas especially poop visible on frequent public/common spaces/areas. There should be a night & early morning patrol giving out hefty fines to prevent dog owners & dogs from allowing this to continue.

Organization:

Commenter: Sourichanh Chanthyasack **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5321 **Comment Id:** 362968 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am certain that these free runs on the beach where she gets to play with many other dogs and people in a low stress environment, are a huge part of her excellent socialization that makes her a kind, obedient, and happy dog. It certainly goes a Kong way to keeping us both healthy. The bay area very much needs,our off leash spaces. There are so many dogs, and so many responsible pet owners counting on you to save our off leash areas. Please don't let us down. Please vote to keep them for all of us.

Organization:

Commenter: Traci Burleigh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5429 **Comment Id:** 363217 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the many times I've been to these parks, I haven't experienced any safety or off-leash dog misbehaviour hazard, dog to dog or dog to person. Dog owner's who take off the leash are well aware of their dog's need to be properly trained to begin with.

Organization:

Commenter: Ed Ramos **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5430 **Comment Id:** 363219 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is important for me that I can enjoy walks and hikes with my dog as I do now. I already feel limited in where I can hike with my dog. Don't let the few irresponsible owners ruin it for everyone. Hiking with your dog is so great for your health too. Please do not limit dogs anymore then they are!!

Organization:

Commenter: Mari Avedano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363301 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Stepping on dog feces numerous times. Seeing dogs putting ther feces on the beach while their owners are off in the distance. The new one- collecting their dog's feces in a plastic bag and leaving the bags in piles on the beach or on the paths. Not even the dencency to put it in a public garbage can!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5489 **Comment Id:** 363362 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The law requires a peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The data I have reviewed does not support it: in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been only 6 reported dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1

wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. Further, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5531 **Comment Id:** 363908 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off leash exercise and play is healthy for both the dog and the owner and also increases the owner/dog bond allowing a dog to become a balanced and healthy member of society.

Organization:

Commenter: Apryl A Guisasola **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5572 **Comment Id:** 363959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I frequent Fort Funston every week and have been for 10 years with my dogs. This is one of the best places for off leash dogs. I actually do not understand the reason for any ban on off leash dogs? In all my time spent there I have never seen a major altercation between dogs or dogs and humans. So why the ban?

Organization:

Commenter: Eric Chapman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5578 **Comment Id:** 363960 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I take my 3 pound Chihuahua for walks through Fort Funston and have never encountered any problems with other off leash dogs or owners. I have found the community to be considerate of eachother and of the area. We respect the site and treasure the opportunity to have this location. I feel safer today on my walks at Fort Funston than I did in years past when fewer people where there. Please dont change it.

Organization:

Commenter: Catherine Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5579 **Comment Id:** 363962 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We rely on the exercise and scenery to keep us active and agile. Being a shelter dog was tough on my dog. She does not do well in confined spaces such as a dog parks. She feels safest in open spaces and shows a profound change of character when at one of 'her' beaches. And because I'm out there enjoying my time with her this GGNRA proposal would in a real sense take away this space/exercise for me.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy R Adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5581 **Comment Id:** 363964 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please do not ban off lease dog play in the Bay Area. We have a large, thriving dog community here in San Francisco. It gives us the opportunity to socialize our dogs and exercise them in ways most other dense urban environments can't. It promotes healthy dogs and healthy people but getting both man and dog out and active.

Organization:

Commenter: Ryan M Sprinkle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5606 **Comment Id:** 364000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm not a dog owner, but I'm not a dog hater, either. But at Crissy Field and Ocean Beach, the off-leash dogs can be a nuisance. I cannot walk without off-leash dogs rushing up to me, or having to listen to owners shouting at their off-leash dogs to obey them. I came out to enjoy the scenery and to watch for birds, not to have to dodge dogs. Moreover, it isn't possible to bring a very small dog or a small child to these places due to the number of large dogs off leash: the owner may think the dog is friendly, but the rest of us have to take precautions with the safety of a small child or small dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Kathleen A Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5665 **Comment Id:** 364099 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am strongly opposed to the "Preferred Alternative" change to the GGNRA policies. The City and the GGNRA are safer because of the off-lease policies and, as I have stated before, there is absolutely no justification for the changes the GGNRA has been trying to force upon the residents for the last 29 years.

Organization:

Commenter: Faye Bernstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5675 **Comment Id:** 364109 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We need off-leash play areas in SF. I love taking my dogs to SF to the beach and to parks. Please keep off-leash areas for dogs to play fetch. It's good for their health and mine.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Novak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5701 **Comment Id:** 364165 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Personally speaking, I can think of no better way to decompress and normalize after a twelve hour shift of wailing sirens, pain, and illness than a morning walk with my dog off leash. Seeing my domesticated beast running free and happy is the best therapy I could ask for.
Organization:
Commenter: Lucas A Freshman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5724 **Comment Id:** 364187 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The main reason that these urban beaches and parks feel safe is the frequent sight of other dog walkers and other people enjoying the landscape.
Organization:
Commenter: Mark Ferree **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5727 **Comment Id:** 364189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Owning a dog builds community- it gets you outside every single morning and evening to see your neighbors who would otherwise only pass in cars or live behind closed doors. It leads to a healthier community, encouraging each other to stay active. But nothing compares to the joy of seeing a dog happily running in his element, joy that is absolutely contagious and makes our community a better place to live.
Organization:
Commenter: Beth L **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5729 **Comment Id:** 364198 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We rely on these off-leash parks to be able to exercise in areas of natural beauty, and also to keep us from adding to dog-parks that are over-crowded and small.
Organization:
Commenter: Audrey E Zmuda **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5783 **Comment Id:** 364298 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Recreation is a public health issue- and having spaces where people can exercise with their dogs encourages exercise, which as we know, greatly improves population health.
Organization: UCSF
Commenter: Nicole D Wilson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5803 **Comment Id:** 364333 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I also visit areas, without a dog, just to enjoy the dogs playing. I frequent Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Mori Point and other areas. The exercise I gain from these walks is not obtainable in the vastly smaller space of my local city parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael B Goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5803 **Comment Id:** 364337 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The presence of many people walking their dogs in the GGNRA adds to public safety. We should not be restricting this healthy form of recreation.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael B Goldstein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5834 **Comment Id:** 364378 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Geoff Garinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5853 **Comment Id:** 364416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs and their humans need off leash time and deserve to enjoy the beauty our area has to offer. The health of dogs and their humans rely on this.

Organization:

Commenter: Amy L Allen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5884 **Comment Id:** 364460 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My dog is very sweet but gets incredibly nervous when on a leash. Furthermore, it is important that she (and I) get enough exercise, which can be very difficult since I can work long hours. Fenced in areas never allow for enough exercise, for either me or my pup.

Organization:

Commenter: Mantissa Johnston **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5919 **Comment Id:** 364633 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please save off leash areas- they are part of the culture and history of this beautiful city and are absolutely necessary for us to maintain a healthy life for our pets in the city. I am an urban planner living in San Francisco with a small dog and I do NOT support the ban on off-leash parks!

Organization:

Commenter: thalia leng **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5922 **Comment Id:** 364641 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs have shown to lower blood pressure and bring depressed persons joy just by being in their company....even if someone does not own a dog they get joy out of watching them play and watching them with their owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Steve J Baechtle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5925 **Comment Id:** 364648 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The health and well being that a relationship with a dog brings is immeasurable.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Corbett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5926 **Comment Id:** 364651 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As an elderly woman with arthritis and cancer, I feel more secure having my German Shepherd with me when I walk.

Organization:

Commenter: Jean F DeMouthe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5941 **Comment Id:** 364765 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: People who walk dogs are in better physical shape than other people (new study out of England). They are less of an expense on our health care system. We should be encouraging this!

Organization:

Commenter: Vivien MacDonald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5951 **Comment Id:** 364776 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Two years ago I was diagnosed with stage 3 breast cancer. To this day, the only

exercise I can do is walking which I only do with my two dogs. I cannot take them on leash because I cannot have them pull me and risk complications. Me, my entire family and our dogs would be significantly limited in our exercise, exposure to wilderness, and our outdoor family time if we are not able to take our dogs to these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Lori D Fineman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364793 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Human safety: In the Rancho area, the above four risk factors affect humans more than dogs do. In fact, I do not believe it is safe to hike the hills without a dog to warn off large predators.

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5958 **Comment Id:** 364794 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Plan is missing giving appropriate weight to the benefits of dog walking on humans. Those benefits are stated in the report, but nowhere is there a calculation of the benefit thereof in weighing the four alternatives.

Organization:

Commenter: Gregg Dieguez **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5971 **Comment Id:** 364834 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Voice Control be maintained because diminution of leash aggression can add substantially to the effectiveness of any good dog management plan. Poor use of leads on frustrated dogs is a trigger to conflict. A trained and well-maintained dog allowed to make, and be rewarded for proper behavior is a permanent solution to many of the objections raised by proponents of the 'anti-dog' mindset. This assumes an aware, educated, responsible and cooperative dog-owning population. The dog community has some distance to travel before attaining this status.

Organization:

Commenter: Garril Page **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6014 **Comment Id:** 364959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having room to run without being on leash is important for the health of our dogs. It's also good for the health of humans because it usually involves much more walking on the part of people than going to the small areas designated as off leash. Being able to play off leash is not only important for the physical health of dogs, but also their mental health as well.

The same for the people who walk them, live with them.

Organization:

Commenter: Cecil Myers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6018 **Comment Id:** 364963 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: My wife packs up the dogs for a day trip or a weekend and we enjoy our time together walking at Crissy Field or on one of the beaches where dogs are allowed off-leash. This is essential for our physical and spiritual well-being, and I know the same is true for many people, dog owners or otherwise.

Organization: "taxpayer and voter"

Commenter: Chuck Humpal **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6019 **Comment Id:** 364965 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the new altered restrictions for off leash restrictions at Fort Funston and Crissy Field. I walk my Golden retriever daily at Fort Funston for the sake of his need to exercise and socialize- -as well as mine! I meet people of all walks of life and socio-economic levels and I see the extremely important benefit of the social interaction that a place like Fort Funston provides

Organization:

Commenter: Mary M Guerra **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6022 **Comment Id:** 364971 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Open space for responsible dog owners and their pets is critical to health and well-being. While I am only 67, the fresh air and socializing (with others and with my Boston Terrier, Georgie) is critical to my mental health (as in keeping me from isolation).

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Sanders **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6023 **Comment Id:** 364972 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Open parks for dogs are important for not just the dogs but their owners as well. They are important for happy healthy socialized dogs

Organization:

Commenter: Ric West **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6028 **Comment Id:** 364996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: San Francisco is a dense, urban environment (as is the entire Bay Area). Dog owners need open spaces to recreate with our dogs for our own health and the health of our animal companions. San Francisco has more dogs than children, and certainly dog owners have just as much need for healthy recreation as families with kids, not to mention families with kids and dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Rhodes Klement **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6058 **Comment Id:** 365278 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my experience, people who do not have good voice control over their dogs to to parks with fences, such as Lafayette Park, near our home. There have been incidents there of people bringing out of control dogs to these areas because they feel there is a safety mechanism in place. This is dangerous for other pets, their owners, and especially children.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah L Stern **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6058 **Comment Id:** 365279 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We must have areas that are off leash for people to take their dogs, under strong voice control at all times, for the health, safety and vitality of our community.

Organization:

Commenter: Sarah L Stern **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6084 **Comment Id:** 365381 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: From another angle, dogs off-leash are dangerous to the public. When one goes to enjoy a public park one should not have to be worried about being harassed, nipped or bitten by dogs running free. Dogs should be allowed to run free only in those public park areas that are fenced and well labeled for dogs to run free.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Malbon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4483 **Comment Id:** 365384 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In most cases the arguments consist of statements made as if representing fact, but without any clear supporting evidence. To me, the biggest example is the section that argues that the 95 dog bites recorded over a 4 year period proves that a change in policy is needed. On its own, 95 dog bites in 4 years sounds like a lot, but the report presents no data on the occurrence of dog bites in other parks with a different policy, and with a comparable number of visitors and dogs.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6305 **Comment Id:** 365458 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: 7. People who walk dogs are in better physical shape than other people (new study out of England). They are less of an expense on our health care system. We should be encouraging this! 8. Dogs not only get people out exercising, they are companions for families and for seniors. Many seniors walk their dogs on and off leash. Their dogs get them out and give them an opportunity to be social. Why are we regulating mans best friend when they provide so much benefit to citizens of all ages.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa P Carey **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6145 **Comment Id:** 365613 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I could go on about the finer points about what I disagree with your plan. But first I have to tell you about how walking my dogs at Fort Funston has saved my sanity. My building burned on January 23, 2014. The Wag Hotel has been taking care of my dogs. Every morning I pick them up and go for an hour or more walk at Fort Funston. I than go to clean up my house. Fort Funston has saved my sanity once again.
Organization:
Commenter: Patricia J LaCava **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6166 **Comment Id:** 365693 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: So many people depend on their dogs as companions (especially the elderly), as a reason for getting exercise, and for protection.
Organization:
Commenter: Morton J Stein **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6360 **Comment Id:** 365801 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: A key piece of evidence cited throughout the report is the data showing 95 dog-attack incidents in the GGNRA from 2008 to 2011. This is cited as an argument in favor of a change in the dog management policy, because it seems to reflect an unacceptable number of such dog bites and attacks. However, the more I think about this, the less convinced I am that this data indicates a truly unacceptable problem.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6204 **Comment Id:** 366007 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many older people now avoid parks and the GGNRA because of all of the dogs, mostly off leash. Even on-leash dogs can jump on a person, especially when they are walked on the long expandable leashes. I think that you need to specify a maximum leash length of 6 feet. I get tired of having leashes wrap around my legs and that entrapment is also dangerous.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6191 **Comment Id:** 366028 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Moreover, GGAS' members have repeated informed us about negative interactions with dogs and dog owners in parts of the GGNRA, typically because an off-leash dog has charged one of our members (on occasion, resulting in a bite) or charged wildlife. Members report avoiding areas they once visited, including Ft. Funston (once a great spot for birding), and Ocean Beach (one member stated she will no longer take her grandchildren there for fear of off-leash dogs and the presence of dog feces in the sand). Our members' experiences are borne out in the hundreds of Criminal Incident Reports that were cited in our May 2011 letter (attached hereto and incorporated by reference).

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Commenter: Michael Lynes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6396 **Comment Id:** 366089 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs can introduce a variety of illnesses and diseases into nature. These include: canine distemper, rabies, parvovirus, plague, giardia, muscle cysts, and leptospirosis. They also transport ticks, keds, tapeworms and fleas. Dogs can bite or attack other hikers. This opens the NPS up for liability. Dogs can be bitten by rattlesnakes or other wildlife. Dogs are best left out of wilderness areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Jacqueline A Steuer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6218 **Comment Id:** 366135 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I used to farm and land scape and have a bad back and easily sore arms from working on a computer constantly and my only joy of every day is walking and running my dog off leash, giving us both a great exercise. It is nearly impossible to run with a dog for they need to consistently stop and smell for enjoyment and to catch their breath... running with him off leash allows him to take a break and go to the bathroom and for me to keep on running as well

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6230 **Comment Id:** 366150 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a resident of San Francisco and have been going to Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and Baker Beach on a weekly basis for the last 10 years because I can walk my dog off leash there. Being able to do this improves the quality of my life and my health and gives me great joy.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6261 **Comment Id:** 366316 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog walking and dog play are more than just healthy human recreation. Dog walking and dog play are a daily, bona fide need for families that include dogs as family members. Many responded to pleas by organizations like San Francisco's world-famous SPCA to adopt dogs. As responsible animal and nature lovers, we will fulfill our commitment to care for our recreational needs and the needs of our canine companions one way or another.
Organization: Dogpatch Dogs
Commenter: Carma J Keats **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6287 **Comment Id:** 366425 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs (and owners) in the other highly urban, only leashed dog environments, yields more neurotic behavior including fighting, biting, social inappropriateness and other behaviors not normally seen when dogs are allowed to run around; running around naturally occurring trees, hills, up and down dunes, running into the water, etc. These are happy dogs. They support happy owners.
Organization:
Commenter: Seth Feigenbaum **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6298 **Comment Id:** 366472 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: My dog and I both need the type of exercise you can only get from off-leash running!
Organization:
Commenter: Tracey N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6616 **Comment Id:** 367221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Sometimes dogs protect their owner to keep them safe.
Organization:
Commenter: Michaella Ravelo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6617 **Comment Id:** 367224 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe.
Organization:
Commenter: Rafael na **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6518 **Comment Id:** 367649 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Safety issues concerning dogs: The data sited by the SEIS of dog incidents does not justify the need for off-leash restrictions. The number of dog bites or attacks (95) from 2008 - 2011 is tiny compared to the millions of dog visits over the GGNRA 80,000 acres. The latest compilation of incidents for 2013: 6 dog bites, 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints from people who were frightened, 1 wildlife killing and one horse bitten. So incidents have gone down in spite of the increase of human population and by inference dog population.
Organization:
Commenter: Nancy Stafford **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367979 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The importance of recreation has not lessened in the intervening years. Rather, it has increased. From the White House to local initiatives, improving health and fitness is a high priority in an increasingly obese and unfit population. The National Park Service itself has introduced the Healthy Parks, Healthy People program, which was the subject of a well-publicized conference in the GGNRA in April, 2011. Thus, the GGNRA should be and could be in the forefront of one of the most important initiatives to improve health in a national context, by highlighting and showcasing people exercising with their dogs in the GGNRA. The people walking dogs in the GGNRA are engaging in a form of exercise now recognized as a compelling and effective route to better health. Research has shown that walking with a dog is likely to result in lengthier and more frequent walks than walking with another person or with a group (See, e.g., Marcus, 2008; and Brown and Rhodes, 2006.)(3). The health benefits of walking with ones dog in the GGNRA, widely noted by those who visit with their dogs, and those who come to see and walk with the dogs, are ignored by the Dog Management Plan.
Organization:
Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367988 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Walking off-leash provides additional physical safety. It is also a safe place for the dogs to walk, because they have the space to meet or to avoid each other. And there is no issue of leash aggression because the dogs are off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6636 **Comment Id:** 368094 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We exercise in these areas with our dog off leash and under voice control for both our own health as well as the health of our dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Ahgela and Daniel Osborne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6646 **Comment Id:** 368210 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is also important to me that my wife and children have a safe place to go when I am traveling. The presence of other dog owners and professional dog walkers adds a critical element of safety to these areas. People walking their dogs are alert to things that do not look right and are always quick to help others at the park. Further, when my elder parents visit they enjoy walking with us and our dog, on and off leash. Access to these areas is critical for a safe walk.

Organization:

Commenter: Les Nagy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6652 **Comment Id:** 368242 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I want dogs to be free! There is no proof that dogs are causing damage. Dogs need exercise and if they are cooped up all the time it is possible that they could incessantly might misbehave. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe and not all dog owners are irresponsible

Organization:

Commenter: Jada N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6654 **Comment Id:** 368245 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Even family pets off leash are often intimidating to small children and even mature adults whose balance is still good, but could be easily knocked down by an over eager dog running into them or near them. And any large dog running freely is intimidating to those who do not feel comfortable around large animals.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Jolliffe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6656 **Comment Id:** 368249 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Our dog Sam is a gentle black lab who loves to swim and play ball. He needs his exercise to stay healthy. Coincidentally, this regular exercise keeps me fit and healthy as well.
Organization:
Commenter: Joan M Kaplan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368386 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Public parks shared by running children and off-leash dogs are potentially unsafe for children (Kahn et al 2003 & De Keuster et al. 2006). Although in theory, it may be possible to somewhat reduce the risk to children exposed to off-leash dogs (Love & Overall 2001), in reality: Any dog is capable of biting, including those with no history of biting and those whose aggressive behavior has been treated, regardless of whether the dog has received obedience training (Reisner et al. 2007, Reisner 2003, Rohrich & Reagan 1999, referenced by Reisner & Shofer 2008, the source of the quotation). NPS must intervene to perform a risk analysis and protect visitors by segregating off-leash activity and explicitly warning visitors about the risks of entering areas where off-leash dogs are allowed.
Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368392 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Complications of dog bites include cosmetic problems, pain, infection, and emotional consequences such as posttraumatic stress disorder. Dog bites are expensive, in terms of emergency, medical and surgical care, vaccinations and the physical and emotional consequences on children and families (Reisner 2013). As noted below under Comparison of Dog Management Policies & Regulations/Risk Assessment, a high proportion of owners of attacking dogs in GGNRA either abscond without providing contact information to the victim or provide bogus contact information, suggesting that in many cases attack victims could not recover payments necessary for medical and psychological treatment associated with injuries.
Organization:
Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368431 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I reviewed FOIA data obtained by the Center for Biological Diversity in 2004, including law enforcement data from GGNRA and from National Parks nationwide. My impression was that the number of serious dog-related incidents in GGNRA documented was in the same ball park if not greater than all incidents from the rest of the U.S. National Parks

combined. The EIS should refer to dog incident data from other Parks in performing a risk assessment of off-leash dog activity and discuss this in the EIS to provide some context for the dog incident data from GGNRA presented in the SEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 2532 **Comment Id:** 368679 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The value of spending time with one's best friend off leash in nature without breaking any laws is crucial to human and canine health and wellness. I am a psychotherapist by trade and can testify to the power of both animal assisted therapy and nature's positive impact on those who suffer.

Organization:

Commenter: Linda Johnson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4506 **Comment Id:** 368681 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Walking my dog improves both my dog's and my physical and mental health. My dog is an SF SPCA certified Animal Assisted Therapy dog. Exercise is an important part of her daily routine, both walking with me and occasionally with her dog walker. Access to the GGNRA for this highly social activity is an important aspect of the quality of life in San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: kathryn Coffey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6544 **Comment Id:** 368700 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It improves my mental health, physical health, commitment to my community and motivation to think forward of our shared responsibility to make it as available and pristine as it is for us now. I really seek ways that my disabled clients can better reap those benefits with improved access and outreach efforts. It is immeasurable how the GGNRA sites aid and support me, my family, and the city as a whole.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary-Lynn Garrett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6549 **Comment Id:** 368702 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'am writing because Dogs and Dog Walkers Keep parks safe and all dogs need to get exercise if they don't the dogs might misbehave.

Organization:

Commenter: Maurice Ali **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4287 **Comment Id:** 368817 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: So if you have no sound scientific data to support the environmental reason to restrict areas to dogs lets look at the safety issue. Well in this case your data is overwhelming in pointing to what are the causes of serious safety incidents - 98% DD NOT INVOLVE DOGS. The problem is people, not dogs. Only 2% ivolve dogs. This alone should really force you to re-think the whole reason for the DEIS.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Norton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6659 **Comment Id:** 369500 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Not all dog owners are irresponsible. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe.

Organization:

Commenter: Irianna Morales **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

HS4000 Health and Safety: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives (Substantive)

1. **Commenters are concerned about the repercussions of limiting the areas where off leash dogs are allowed. When dogs are forced into smaller spaces, especially fenced-in spaces, stress levels can increase due to confinement. Commenters feel that this could lead to a dog population in San Francisco that is less social, less exercised, and more aggressive, ultimately leading to more incidents between dogs and between dogs and people. Additionally, restricting dog owners to smaller spaces will degrade these areas and other community parks and would worsen the park experience for dog owners.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 1007 **Comment Id:** 351414 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not adequately address the environmental and social impact of forcing large numbers of people and dogs into much smaller areas. Reducing the amount of area available for off-leash will significantly degrade the park experience for people with dogs. It will increase conflicts

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2195 **Comment Id:** 353200 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I urge you to consider the long-term impacts of dramatically raising the activation energy of hundreds of families and individuals in the city in order to get them to go outside with their dogs. Increased traffic congestion, number of cars in the city, and a less fit, obese population are all obvious long term side effects of this excessive and poorly thought out plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Melissa Severini **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4788 **Comment Id:** 361533 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. The need for open space areas for dogs is important not only for the health of the dog, but to maintain adequate space between dogs. Limiting this open space will therefore result in overcrowding of dogs in the dog parks - leading to unfortunate situations of more aggression and a less relaxed atmosphere.

Organization:

Commenter: Jennifer Kattula **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5511 **Comment Id:** 363889 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Not to mention that dog outnumber children in San Francisco, the GGNRA is proposing that the other 90% o people essentially "stack" their dogs on top of one another at the specific parks that sanction. This will create FAR MORE PROBLEMS in the community. As a professional dog walker and business owner since 2005, the negative ramifications far outnumber the reasons to pass along their plan. The analogy can be made for people as it is for dogs, the less "space" in a park, the more agitated people and or dogs may become. Dogs do not have the same reasoning and decision making we do, and therefore dogs will become more territorial and dog fights will become epidemic. Not only dog fighting, and barking creating constant noise problems for local residents, but all fights may lead to humans be injured.
Organization: SuperDog City, LLC
Commenter: Corey M Vitale **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

2. **Commenters believe that off leash dogs should be separated from other visitors, especially children and the elderly. Commenters are concerned about dogs under voice control not being responsive to their owners or walkers around other park visitors. Several commenters were specifically concerned about the off leash area proposed near the Farallone Elementary School.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5 **Comment Id:** 337956 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I would like to voice my support for Crissy Field maps 10f and 10c. These two maps achieve two important objectives: 1. It leaves a large area where dogs can run around off leash (ROLA) on both the field AND a long stretch of beach. Dog walkers should be able to enjoy sizable areas of the beach and field as ROLA. 2. It preserves East Beach for a place for young children and families free of dogs. East Beach is the most used area of Crissy field. My own daughter was run over and left with a bloody nose by a dog chasing a ball. Her twin sister had stepped in dog feces that same trip. The fact is that part of the beach is too heavily impacted as it is. Removing the dogs and creating a safe stretch of beach free of dogs is a fair thing to do for families.
Organization:
Commenter: Philip M Brady **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 70 **Comment Id:** 338959 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I very strongly oppose Alternative C. Frankly, I am shocked to see that an "off-leash" dog park is being proposed for the area between Tamarind and Le Conte streets. As noted in the plan, this area is right across the street from an elementary school!!! It would be quite dangerous for small school children to encounter off-leash dogs just across the street from their play ground! As voice control is ineffective for most dogs, there would be a high risk of injury to

children. In addition, there are homes along Tamarind Street that would now have an "off-leash" dog park, literally in their front yard!! Again, this seems untenable in terms of potential dog attacks to the people who live on this street. (I live on this street!). Also, it seems highly likely that off-leash dogs would easily run into and damage the yards of these homes and the grounds of the Farallone View Elementary School.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Madsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 359 **Comment Id:** 351133 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: am writing to you in much distress because of the ongoing dog situation at Crissy Field. Let the dogs have some portion of the field or designate some more remote park for their use. Crissy Field is a heavily used Park and it is insane and unsafe to allow the current situation to continue.

Organization:

Commenter: Mary Faust **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 724 **Comment Id:** 353051 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to report that I was running on Ocean Beach this morning (at around 45th Ave). A dog, off leash, came up from behind me and jumped on my back. His owner was about a quarter of a block away. Frightened, it was a medium to large sized dog, I started screaming for her to get her dog away from me - the dog was continuing to jump on me and was growling. I turned my back to the dog and remained still(although I kept yelling at the lady to get her dog), as this is not the first time this has happened to me on this stretch of the beach, and experience has taught me not to continue running, to remain still and to turn my back to the dog. The owner proceeded to lash out at me - asking me why I was being so nasty while her dog continued to jump on my back and growl at me! Several unpleasant"French" words were exchanged, but the upshot was that she felt it was my fault. Luckily, I was not harmed, but just shaken up a bit by this encounter and certainly by her response. Human nature baffles me as her dog clearly ran after me and assaulted me on an area of Ocean Beach in which dogs are to be kept on leashes. Then to add insult to injury, the owner of the dog attributes the problem to be me! It's quite laughable, really. As I said this is not the first time this has happened to me, but I am certainly not going to stop running on the beach and so I hope that a dog plan will be put in place and enforced that will allow dogs the freedom to run off leash in certain areas while affording that same freedom to humans so that they can run unharmed.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. **Several commenters are concerned about the leash requirements in certain areas that they see as unsafe for leashed dogs, such as Big Beach at Muir Beach and the sand ladder of Fort Funston. Commenters state that leashes in these areas could endanger the walkers who**

GGNRA161564

must control the dogs in unstable settings or could possibly strand the dogs and owners during high tide.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 369 **Comment Id:** 351273 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In the NPS's "preferred alternative" for Muir Beach, leashes would be required on Big Beach. The NPS's justification for the workability of such a change is that Little Beach is there for all who want to let their dogs run. From a safety standpoint, we are concerned that visitors will cross over to access Little Beach and become stranded during high tides, then try to unsafely cross over the rocks to get back to "Big Beach", creating more incidents for our emergency services.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Wynn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3930 **Comment Id:** 360075 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For example insisting to have dogs on leash on the steep slopes of Funston, including the southern sand stairs. This will be extremely dangerous for the feeble, the elderly and any one else who finds traversing such terrain difficult-even without being jerked around by a dog who traverses the stairway with four feet instead of two. Adding a LEASHED dog in such an environment is not only extremely dangerous, it lacks common sense, Falling down stairs as a result of being jerked from a dog on a leash is not only dangerous to the dog owner but to other people on the sand stairs. A stairway that often is overcrowded with families including small children.

Organization:

Commenter: Fred A Andrews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. **Off leash dogs are a considerable concern for many commenters who expressed the desire to have dogs leashed in all areas of the park or banned entirely. Commenters are unhappy about unruly dog behavior, dog waste and bags, hostile dog owners, and disturbances to wildlife and habitat.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 192 **Comment Id:** 350075 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a resident of the Homestead Valley area of Mill Valley for over 17 years. I leave next to the Homestead Fire Rd as drawn on MAP 3. I use the fire road on a weekly basis and STRONGLY BELIEVE THE DOGS NEED TO BE ON LEASH OR BANNED ALTOGETHER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: 1. I have been bitten by a dog. The dog was not on a leash or under voice control. 2. Dog walkers routinely walk 4 dogs who are rarely on leash. I see these dogs run wild disturbing hikers, families, bike riders, local wildlife (Rabbits,birds, etc.), digging/crush native vegetation, and defecating on the trail. 3. I routinely see "plastic poop bags" on the trail unclaimed - unsightly and unsanitary. 4. I have seen dog on dog clashes. I get concerned the dogs may then turn on a human - adult or child

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 508 **Comment Id:** 351836 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: This comment is for the Homestead Fire Road in Homestead Valley. I support Preferred Alternative F - Dogs on Leash because: 1. I am a resident of the area and use the trail frequently. I have been bitten by a dog on this trail and fear for my safety every time I see a dog on the trail. I have frequently been approached by barking/growling dogs not on-leash or under voice control. 2. Commercial dog walkers use this trail and typically have 3-6 dogs not on leash and not under voice control (dogs running loose and bothering people (other animals/vegetation). I have also been harassed by commercial dog walkers who feel they have control of the space and can do what ever they want.
Organization:
Commenter: unkown unknown **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6474 **Comment Id:** 368829 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Off-leash dogs can be a serious safety risk and are a huge disturbance to the increasingly smaller numbers of wildlife that remain in the GGNRA. There is no easy way to balance human pets and wildlife in the GGNRA, but the scientific evidence presented by the National Park Service and independent experts clearly point to the conclusion that dogs must be on leash or excluded from any GGNRA area where endangered and threatened wildlife and their habitat, plus native plants, have been documented.
Organization:
Commenter: Celeste Langille **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

5. Many commenters, especially senior citizens and disabled people are unable to exercise their dogs appropriately on leash. Reducing off leash areas would limit the areas where senior citizens and disabled people can exercise with their dogs.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 155 **Comment Id:** 349884 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The elimination of major portions of National Park services for off leash dogs, particularly Crissy Field and Fort Funston, severely hampers my ability to keep fit as a senior citizen. Recreation is not about watching my dog run in a small enclosed area. I am 69 years old and walk vigorously at fort funston and crissy field along with my 22 lb schnauzer sally off leash. I can not put her on leash as it throws me off balance. Your new proposal virtually eliminates my ability to recreate and will make me go to local san francisco parks to get my workout. This is unfair to san francisco as we gave the land to you for fort funston and against my health interests as a senior citizen.
Organization:
Commenter: cheryl e traverse **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 238 **Comment Id:** 350168 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: For many urban dog guardians, especially seniors who find it difficult exercise their pets while on-leash, the GGNRA represents the only place where they can allow their dogs to play, romp around and release a lot of energy. Take away this haven for exercise, and guardians may be unable to meet the physical needs of their pets. Daily exercise, like food and water, is essential to a dog's proper health and well-being.

Organization:

Commenter: chris benson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 873 **Comment Id:** 353482 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a disabled person with a companion dog, I really value the ability I have to take my dog to places like Chrissy Field and Fort Funston where he can run off leash. I have Spina Bifida and use leg braces and a cane, as a result it is very difficult for me to walk my dog on leash. The loss of access to such places would be a great blow to both of us, and severely limit our options for outdoor recreation in the city. I find it very hard to use the existing enclosed dog parks in the city, as the dogs there tend to be very territorial and aggressive. In the past I have been knocked over by these animals, and so I am forced to sit on a bench. My dog is protective and will then sit beside me and thus not take advantage of being off-leash. This is not a problem that occurs at more open spaces such as Chrissy Field and Fort Funston, where I am able to walk more freely and he can accompany me.

Organization:

Commenter: Charles J Whelon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

6. **Commenters noted the constant presence of dogs and dog walkers as an enhanced safety measure. Many commenters feel safer when walking with their dogs, as the dogs provide protection from wildlife and potentially ill-intentioned people. Prohibiting dogs on trails may exclude people, especially women, from recreating in these areas because they do not feel safe on the trails by themselves.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 247 **Comment Id:** 350347 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I do not own a dog, I have never owned one. But I can remember when these areas were unsafe for women, Ft Funston at any time. It was the dog walkers who came and took back this park area from the bums and drug dealers, not the GGNRA police or park rangers. It has been the dog walkers who have kept this a safe place for me to walk. There is so much space in the GGNRA - I ask that you do the right thing and give the off leash dog walkers more land. There are more dogs than children in San Francisco. For many people these dogs are their family who keep them active and therefore mentally and physically healthy. Ideally, all GGNRA would be dog friendly. If you can allow guns and ATVs in Federal parks, dogs should be able to walk off leash.

Organization:
Commenter: Barbara Fugate **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1429 **Comment Id:** 352535 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a woman who frequently hikes alone during the week, many times, the only other people I see on the trails are other folks walking their dogs. When you take that user group out of the mix, it feels LESS SAFE. This was the case when many former off leash sites in SF became leash only. Suddenly, no one was there. The regular folk disappeared who'd been daily walkers.
Organization:
Commenter: Kim Wonderley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4081 **Comment Id:** 353606 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: It is also worth noting that parks that allow off-leash recreating make those parks safer for everyone. People with dogs visit these parks rain-or-shine, day-or-night, because dogs always need to be exercised. That means there's always someone in the parks and solo people out for walks or jogs are safer for it, because they aren't alone.
Organization:
Commenter: Kristy Brady **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4596 **Comment Id:** 361119 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The other safety argument is that women, in particular, feel safer when with a dog. I would not feel comfortable hiking on any trail alone without my canine companion for protection. By banning dogs on many of our trails here in Marin, you are virtually cutting off access to women, many of whom would stop using the trails if they couldnt bring their dog.
Organization:
Commenter: cassandra fimrite **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

7. **Commenters state that the need to exercise their dogs in turn forces them to exercise, resulting in better health for both dog and person. In a crowded city such as San Francisco, dogs needs areas to exercise in order to release pent up energy. Commenters fear that restricting dogs to on leash exercise or smaller off leash areas will result in stressed dogs that will act out in non-safe ways, increasing dog-related incidents at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Commenters fear that a more restrictive area where dogs are permitted would cause a decline in their own health, as well as that of their dogs. In addition, dog owners and dog walkers feel a sense of community with others they meet on regular visits to exercise their dogs. Several commenters who do not own dogs relate that watching dogs run on the beaches is part of the enjoyment of California parks.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 176 **Comment Id:** 349987 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I greatly value that San Francisco has many official off leash areas for dogs. Dogs are an important part of our society, they provide companionship, stress relief and an easy icebreaker for people in a community to start interacting. Dogs need exercise to be well behaved, happy members of the community. My dog loves to run in the offleash areas, and would not be able to get adequate exercise if he were only allowed on leash. We monitor him closely to make sure he does not disturb other people enjoying the area. Please reconsider the proposed restrictions on offleash areas. The current rules have worked well since the 70s, please do not reduce our access to allow our dog and their owners (us!) healthy and happy lives.

Organization: ngmoco:)

Commenter: Amber Morey-Wu **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2104 **Comment Id:** 355701 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Everyday I see, firsthand, the power of the human-dog relationship, and it is difficult to see how that relationship can truly be fostered when the dog is inhibited from free play. Free, off-leash play in an outdoors environment offers an opportunity to build trust and discipline that would not be as available should this restrictive alternative be implemented. Many of my patients leave their homes for the sole purpose of taking their dogs to one of these amazing off-leash areas and would otherwise stay at home, missing out on much-needed exercise, social interaction, and sun. Running in an open environment is also pertinent to the health of these urban animals, especially larger dogs, who were often bred to perform rigorous physical activity and to freely roam farmlands.

Organization: UCSF

Commenter: Christopher Stauffer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3193 **Comment Id:** 357962 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am not a dog owner, but I think that limiting dog walking to leash-only on trails and beaches in Marin would significantly decrease quality of life in Marin. I hike extensively in Marin and I've never had an issue with off-leash dogs. To my mind, seeing dogs run off-leash on the beach is one of the great things about California, and I would be sad to see this freedom limited.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura T Landman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2366 **Comment Id:** 358399 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs aid in the health and well being of all their owners, both young and old, providing exercise and companionship. They are the lifeline for many elderly people. Dog owners are not asking for anything more ..... we just want to keep what we have allowing us to

utilize trails and beaches designated for dogs lovers, some allowing our dogs to play freely off leash and get the much needed exercise they also need.

Organization:

Commenter: Diane Barrett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3930 **Comment Id:** 360056 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This is not good for me because I suffer from depression. I am veteran of the armed forces and find great comfort running with my dog, indeed my doctor insists that I continue to run and that my companionship with my dog is healthy and should be maintained. Not allowing me to recreate with my dog directly affects my well-being in a negative way.

Organization:

Commenter: Fred A Andrews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

8. Commenters do not believe that the data presented in the SEIS regarding the health impacts from dog-related incidents and dog waste are not representative of the actual conditions at Golden Gate National Recreation Area; commenters feel that the adverse impacts are inflated, as the data are not relevant to the actual conditions. Other commenters are concerned about the health impacts from pet waste that is not disposed of properly. Additionally, one commenter suggested performing a risk assessment to determine the impacts off leash dogs have on the health and safety of other visitors.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 663 **Comment Id:** 352857 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Lastly, health is a concern (Foster 2006). Fecal and urine waste can carry pathogens (bacterial, viral, parasitic) that may affect visitors and other animals. The leading cause of illness is from contaminated water. Exposure to contaminated water from dog waste can result in fever, nausea, gastroenteritis as well as flu-like symptoms. It is well documented that areas with unmanaged and unleashed dogs show a poorer water quality than areas with strong leash laws. A state law already prohibits dogs on public swimming beaches for health reasons. A stricter policy will keep recreational areas even cleaner. Feral cats and cat colonies are also mentioned. The largest concern is feral cat and bird interactions (Winter; Wallace 2006). However, the plan does not go into detail about what can be done to ensure nonissues with cats nor discuss further into cat colonies. Cat colonies should be kept clean for health reasons as well as the spread of rodents that can carry disease (mice species have been found feeding on food the cats do not eat) and insect pests (such as cockroaches) (Winter; Wallace 2006). Unmanaged and uncontrolled animals should be taken care of by animal control or park management accordingly

Organization:

Commenter: Faith Wall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4224 **Comment Id:** 362231 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The report suggests on page 14 that "... An increase in nutrients from dog

excrement in concentrated areas could result in some areas becoming overfertilized and lead to changes in plant species and distribution as well as changes in soil organisms." Also, on page 20 "the overwhelming smell of urine in park areas with heavy dog use (e.g., Fort Funston) may also affect visitor experience at the park." The common consensus is that dog excrement at Fort Funston is in general effectively managed with significant public participation. Perhaps the reported smell is coming from the poorly maintained human toilet facilities managed by GGNRA. From page 22 "A health concern associated with dog waste is pathogens that can infect humans if ingested." No data provided to support this as an issue. Literature is cited without any investigation of the actual conditions at the sites. Again, the issue of public trust when the efforts of so many volunteers helping to clean the park are ignored.

Organization:

Commenter: G K Webb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368404 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS seems to have completely avoided explicit discussion of risk assessment of off-leash dog activity that other entities have performed in relation to their determinations about how to manage the risk of off-leash dog activity. The EIS should explicitly provide a risk assessment of off-leash dog activities in GGNRA and use such an assessment to determine how the risks can be eliminated. Where those risks cannot be eliminated, such as many parks have concluded cannot be done, then GGNRA should be explicit about which visitors and/or user groups cannot safety interact with off leash dogs without risk to their visitor experience or safety.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368788 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: SEIS, page 375, argues that dog waste and dog urine affect soils. As usual, SEIS offers no scientific citations. It cites NPS 1999, which is Natural Resources Section, Resources Management Plan, Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Prepared by Golden Gate National Recreation Area. December 1999. Thats useless on many counts: 1) Its not a scientific document, 2) Its GGNRA citing itself, 3) Its a citation to a huge document, with no page number, so no one can check the citation. SEIS presents, in lieu of evidence, only the usual can, could, and very many mays. GGNRA made the dog waste harms soils claim long ago, during Negotiated Rulemaking. In the Technical Subcommittee, GGNRA was asked for evidence to support their claim. The request was repeated at subsequent Technical Subcommittee meetings. No evidence was ever produced. In comment on the DEIS I pointed out the DEIS still offered no evidence, even though the DEIS repeated the claim. Now we are at SEIS. The claim is still made; there is still no evidence. Really, after three strikes, you are out (and should withdraw the claim).

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369656 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: THE SEIS DOES NOT ADEQUATELY ANALYZE HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES The SEIS, like the DEIS, does not provide an honest evaluation of impacts of dogs on human health and safety. This is particularly true in the SEIS discussion of dog bites. On p. 35, the SEIS says: Data collected by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention show that approximately 4.5 million Americans are bitten by dogs each year, and one in five dog bites results in injuries that require medical attention. This statement is repeated on p. 336, followed by additional information that: Small children are typically the most common victims of dog-related injuries because of their natural behaviors, such as running, yelling, grabbing, and hitting, which may threaten a dog. ... Elderly people are also considered at a higher risk of complications from dog-related injuries due to their increased susceptibility to bruising, lacerations, or broken/dislocated bones. On p. 1228, the SEIS adds to this expanded description of dog injuries that: In general, children are the most common victims of serious dog bites in the United States, with 70 percent of fatal dog attacks and more than half of serious bite wounds involving children... This is followed by an anecdotal quote from a DEIS comment from a parent whose small children were frightened by off-leash dogs. The perception created by these statistics, and in particular the way they are presented, is that dogs in the GGNRA present a significant health risk for people, especially children and seniors. Children are likely to be seriously bitten and even killed by off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. The problem is that the SETS presents only part of the story. The reality is that few dog bites happen in park settings like the GGNRA. In one of the most comprehensive analyses of injuries due to dog bites, Canadian researchers searched a national database of all reports of injuries throughout Canada in 1996 (Canadian Hospitals Injury Reporting and Prevention Program, or CHIRPP; the study can be found at: http://www.phac-aspc.gc .calinjury-bles/chirpp/injrep rapbles/dogbit-eng.php). Dog bites represented 1% of all injuries in the CHTRPP database.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369660 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: So what about the second claim that conflicts between users have begun to rise? The SEIS offers no specific evidence to support this claim. However, it does discuss the total number of dog-related incidents, which is all we have available to consider. Table 5: Number and Types of Incident Reports Within GGNRA, 2001 -2011, on p. 253 of the SETS shows a total of 4,932 dog-related incidents, out of total number of incidents reported of 45,700; that is, dog-related incidents make up 11 of the total number of incidents. The non-dog-related incidents range from Drug Offences, to Trespassing, with nearly one-third listed as Other. Other clearly includes most violent crime in the GGNRA, from murder, to rape, to robbery, but the SEIS does not provide any information on how common such violent crime - the true safety risk for park visitors - is in the GGNRA. The first thing to notice is that the percentage of total incidents that are dog related hovers around ii % throughout the ten year period (ranging from a low of 6% 006 to a high of 14% in 2004). This table does not show any significant increase in incidents, and by extension, in conflicts over the last ten years. Theres no indication in this data that there have been increasing problems with dogs over at least the last ten years. This

contradicts the SETS stated reason on p. 6 for a new Dog Management Plan. A closer look at the data presented in Tables 11 through 28 (pp. 313 - 328) listing the number and type of dog-related incidents at various GGNRA sites shows that the vast majority of incidents at each site were for leash violations or merely being in an closed area, without any wildlife disturbance or resource degradation. Clearly, there is no safety crisis or wildlife disturbance crisis or resource degradation crisis caused by dogs in the GGNRA.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 3 **Comment Id:** 337953 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Eliminating areas where dogs (under voice control) are able to run freely with make those few parks in San Francisco with off leash areas more crowded than they already are. It will negatively impact the health and welfare of dogs and their owners. It will increase pollution by forcing people to drive further to reach an off leash area.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel M Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 337963 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My comment is on dog use plans for Mori Point. If all dog owners were walking docile pets, then perhaps this would not be important. However, some dogs are excitable and may behave in ways that are upsetting or frightening to human users, particularly cyclists or those with small children. Most dog owners will self-police, and choose the higher-ground bypass trails if they know their dogs tend to bark at children or lunge at other dogs or cyclists. There are other possibilities that could further protect and preserve use for everyone. For example, there is no need for dogs to be allowed on Bootleggers Steps (dogs don't need stairs) - - but you don't have any proposed maps that appear to differentiate between areas designed for the comfort of humans and areas likely to be popular among dog walkers.

Organization:

Commenter: Abigail R Marshall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 16 **Comment Id:** 337973 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a 32 year resident of the Sunset District of SF and a dog owner who has used Fort Funston as a uniquely wonderful site to walk my dog for years, I must register my extreme disappointment at the proposals put forth by the NPS. Walking a dog off leash is one of the pinnacles of the dog ownership experience. It allows the dog to "be a dog". It allows the owner to get outdoors and walk in a pleasant environment with the companionship of their pet and to experience the pleasure of seeing their pet happy, free, socializing with other dogs, and getting real, unfettered exercise. Walking a dog on a leash is a mere shadow of the experience of walking a dog off leash and leashed walking should in no way be seen as an equivalent to off leash walking.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 29 **Comment Id:** 337989 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dog park near Farallone Elementary School. PLEASE NO. Please see below my letter to the Farallone View Elemenrty and San Mateo County Sheriff. It will only make the

current issues of crime on campus worse. Use the precautionary principle and leave the off-leash dog group to find an area far away from children.

Organization:

Commenter: Brenda Donald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 35 **Comment Id:** 337998 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The sand ladder at fort funston is an unstable and dangerous trail. Introducing leashes would increase the risk of injury to people and dogs alike.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert D Ellison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 73 **Comment Id:** 338962 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: We would prefer a complete ban. However, barring that, the preferred park solution (21F) would be our second choice. We feel that the organized off leash dog groups have enjoyed a louder voice due to their organized numbers, drowning out individual comments like ours. Our personal safety has been put at risk by off leash dogs on more than a few occasions and the owners quickly flee, leaving us no way to put on record such incidents. This leaves the off leash support groups the freedom to claim that there are few, if any, such incidents. We are seniors and as we age, feel less able to fend off, and thus fear these aggressive dogs and their belligerent owners.

Organization:

Commenter: Charles Parker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 27 **Comment Id:** 343277 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are plenty of places in San Francisco that people can enjoy dog free. We need to keep the spaces that are now available for people with dogs. It is well established that having dogs, and being able to exercise them, is vital for the health of many people, particularly older adults, for whom dog walking is one of the most effective and safe forms of exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Barbara Milman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 109 **Comment Id:** 343887 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Studies have shown that owning a dog can add 5-7 years to human lifespan. In our sedentary and obese society dog ownership must be strongly encouraged and enabled. We demand open space to exist and run. Wilderness and nature belong to all humans and animals.

Organization: Pythom Inc

Commenter: Tina O Sjogren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 122 **Comment Id:** 346270 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I do not support the plan to allow dogs off leash in any public area. The idea of dogs being under "voice control" is an illusion. Dogs cannot always be controlled by their owners at all times. Any dog that is seemingly under control can easily get out of control when another dog is near. Small children are also at risk from unleashed dogs. Even birds and squirrels tend to excite the unleashed dog. Voice control is not an acceptable alternative to leashing dogs in public areas. In my opinion, it is simply too dangerous to let dogs run free where young children are playing.

Organization:

Commenter: kevin morris **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 154 **Comment Id:** 349882 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There can be conflicts between dog owners, commercial dog walkers, the dogs, and the general public. This is obvious if not inevitable when public land is in such close proximity to a large urban area. I have been assaulted (by a human) at Crissy Field, for example, and was frustrated that I could not find an NPS LE Officer to report the assault. And, to be honest, when one of the dogs in my care grabbed a picnicker's sandwich, I bought the person a new sandwich. I understand and accept the responsibility of having dogs in a public area, maintain an up to date insurance policy, pick up every dog poop I find, behave as responsibly as I can, and avoid conflict at all costs. But the solution to the potential for conflict is not to remove or further restrict this one user group.

Organization: Seth Green Canine Care

Commenter: Seth Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 157 **Comment Id:** 349893 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Single hikers, especially woman, are safer when they have a dog with them. You are limiting access to the outdoors if you further restrict their ability to walk with a dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah S Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 178 **Comment Id:** 349989 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In particular, closing altogether the East Beach at Crissy Field, and especially the largest part of Baker Beach to dogs altogether, is completely unacceptable. By doing this, you will: 1. Crowd a large amount of dogs into much smaller, adjacent areas, creating overcrowding and potentially dangerous situations.

Organization:

Commenter: Dianne T Younger Rosse **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 193 **Comment Id:** 350083 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: On mixed use, unleashed doges which do not respond to voice commands are a real risk to small children visiting the beach, as parents cannot ascertain if each of these uncontrolled dogs are an immediate risk to thier children or not. Similarly, older people like myself risk falls when uncontrolled dogs jump up on us or trip us. This is a serious risk, and a fall can cause a broken bone, which can be life threatening at my age. And my young nephew who is frighted of uncontrolled dogs cannot visit our beach at all.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathleen McCowin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 194 **Comment Id:** 350085 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It would be a reasonable thing to restrict access to dogs on our pristine beaches. I often could see dogs defecation on Ocean beach which create health hazard to our children who like to enjoy playing on the sand.
Organization:
Commenter: nafiss griffis **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 213 **Comment Id:** 350122 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Recreating for a senior citizen is walking with my dog not on leash. On leash is too hard for me and throws off my posture.
Organization:
Commenter: cheryl e traverse **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 221 **Comment Id:** 350137 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I walk my dog off leash at Fort Funston almost every day. This is a great place both for dogs and for their owners. I am elderly and retired. This is the only place where I can go to walk my dog off leash. Please don't take this away from me.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 226 **Comment Id:** 350146 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is very difficult for dog owner, especially seniors and the disabled, to exercise their dogs on-leash. We need large open off-leash spaces to adequately exercise our

pets.

Organization:

Commenter: keith ruoff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 230 **Comment Id:** 350152 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I disapprove of the restrictions you intend to implement on the currant off-leash areas of the GGNPS. I am elderly with a knee replacement. I am unable to physically exercise my dog properly on a leash. He gets better quality of exercise, a more natural form of exercise and socialization in these off-leash areas. Please let our dogs have a large off-leash area so they can exercise and be better citizens.

Organization:

Commenter: Shirley Scofield **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 239 **Comment Id:** 350170 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please keep ALL our dogwalking opportunities. For us old people, walking our dogs in these traditional places is how we get our exercise. And they need to run.

Organization:

Commenter: Birrell T Walsh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 268 **Comment Id:** 350385 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Limiting off leash access at Muir beach is a great idea. Sometimes the beach is a big toilet for dogs who have urinated and pooped all over the sand. Owners rarely clean up after their dogs, and it is a health hazard to children and adults as well.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 282 **Comment Id:** 350464 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Part of the reason I moved to Mill Valley and Marin was to be closer to the beauty and trails, and those that allowed me to hike and run with my dog for both of our exercise. I run trails for hours and hours weekly and although appreciate the safe surroundings of Marin, also depend on my dog being an added security measure should something happen to me while out on the trails alone. (remember story of woman in east bay assaulted and raped my a man on the trails while she was running.) I do acknowledge that it is the responsibility of all dog owners to keep their pets under control as well as only allow those that do not risk interference for others but that is just the same as any dog walking on leash or at a dog park. The majority of dog owners are responsible and those dogs under voice control. Please do not ruin our enjoyment due to a few dog owners and look for alternatives to monitor and control them, not the majority.

Organization:
Commenter: Kara N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 285 **Comment Id:** 350468 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: It is possible to encourage responsible stewardship of our dogs- on & off leash- and eliminating off leash areas will only lead to more "incidents" as those off-leash dog-owners are marginalized into smaller & smaller areas.
Organization:
Commenter: karen eisenstadt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 295 **Comment Id:** 350493 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: With your new and severe restrictions to substantially fewer areas where dogs can be at all, and almost no areas where they can be off-leash, these areas will become overcrowded, worn and rundown. The increased tension of the gathering of a higher concentration of dogs in these limited spaces, having had substantially less exercise, can create conflicts and inevitably aggressive situations with grave repercussions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 300 **Comment Id:** 350541 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: SAVE OFF LEASH! Off leash dog walking in GGRNA's off leash areas greatly increases me and my pooch's quality of life on a daily basis. Reducing off leash in GGRNA will cause severe and unsafe crowding in other off leash areas within GGRNA and other San Francisco Parks. Please do not make changes to off leash in GGRNA.
Organization:
Commenter: Lane G Gunsolley **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 311 **Comment Id:** 350559 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: For minimum public safety any dog in the National Park should be on a leash. There should be no off leash areas for two reasons: first, as you know, many dog owners will abuse that privilege by allowing their dogs unleashed into leash areas. Second, dogs are animals and therefore totally unpredictable, as anyone who has been around them and whether bitten or not can attest. Even when on leash they injure people, particularly large size dogs that owners cannot control. For that reason I believe the study is remiss in not addressing the hazard of large size dogs in the park.
Organization:
Commenter: Charles P Burns **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 313 **Comment Id:** 350562 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like to applaud your efforts to limit dogs in the recreation areas. I fully support these efforts. I have often encountered dogs whose owners have taken them off leash. When the dogs go to the bathroom off the trail, the owners pretend not to notice and do not clean up after them. Additionally, these dogs may have run through poison oak and then run up to people or other dogs, with the potential of spreading poison oak to people. I also note that when I ask the question "Shouldn't your dog be on a leash?," the answers are often hostile with shouting, name calling and use of profane language etc. This is a danger to myself (a single senior citizen and person of color) which I am glad the GG NRA is willing to address and try to limit.

Organization:

Commenter: Fay Shon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 333 **Comment Id:** 350599 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Rancho - as a single woman, hiking with a dog offers more security than when alone (see Pacifica police report encouraging hiking with others). would like access, with dog, to more of Rancho trails. Rancho: where trails emanate from a neighborhood where dog walking has historically occurred, provide some kind of dog walking opportunity.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 335 **Comment Id:** 350609 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Off leash dogs protect single women walking alone.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 346 **Comment Id:** 350649 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Facts About the Dangers of Dog Poop. Keep it off the trails and away from creeks! The U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) confirms pet waste can spread parasites including hookworms, ringworms, tapeworms and Salmonella. When infected dog poop comes into contact with your lawn, the poop will eventually "disappear", but the parasite eggs can linger for years! When a human or animal comes into contact with that soil through everyday activities like walking barefoot, gardening or playing, they risk infection from those eggs ... even years after the poop is gone. Pet waste is teaming with E. Coli and other harmful bacteria including fecal coliform bacteria, which causes serious kidney disorders, intestinal illness, cramps and diarrhea in humans. (There are 23 million fecal coliform bacteria in a single gram of pet waste!) Dog poop often contains roundworm larvae, which cause blindness. If a human ingests a roundworm larva, it can migrate through the body causing disease to the

brain, lungs, kidneys, liver, heart or eyes. So when people (especially children) touch soil, dog toys or anything that has been in contact with dog feces and then touch their mouths, they can become infected. Dog poop doesn't just "wash away" or disappear. So if you're not disposing of your dog's waste, you're putting yourself, your family, your dog and your water supply at risk. http://dogtalk101.blogspot.com/2010/01/facts-about-dangers-of-dog-poop.html

Organization:

Commenter: Jerry Jenkins **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 352 **Comment Id:** 350698 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs need exercise and on leash exercise is not sufficient for many dogs larger than a Chihuahua. I am over 60 years old and no longer jog with my dogs. I cannot hike over sand dunes at Fort Funston and want to walk on paved roads while my dogs are off leash. Your "preferred" plan for Fort Funston will make it no longer a place I will want to walk my dogs, so I will not go there anymore. My husband does not walk well and he can only walk on the paved roads and cannot manage a leash as he uses walking poles to maintain balance. He cannot use the off road areas either. So Good bye, Fort Funston. Chrissy Field will get the overflow in a reduced area and will soon show damage. You are creating an environment that will be damaging by upsetting a balance that works right now.

Organization:

Commenter: Judith A Palmer Moran **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 362 **Comment Id:** 351161 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Throughout the process conducted to produce the Plan, I heard residents of San Mateo County ask not to have trail access for dog walkers reduced. As I reviewed the Alternatives, I am concerned by how many trails are being prohibited to dog walkers. By prohibiting access to trails used for decades by both dog walkers and non-dog walkers, it may discourage people from using the parks and trails. Furthermore, many women have expressed to me, including my own wife, that without their dog they would not feel safe walking on open space trails. Having their dog present provides a level of security that otherwise would not be provided.

Organization: San Mateo County Government Center, District 3

Commenter: Don Horsley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 363 **Comment Id:** 351166 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: As a victim of dog attack, I know that dogs off lease pose a real threat to children and adults using the Presido. This is an inner city park and the access to this area, without threat of attack from personal pets should be a highest use priority.

Organization:

Commenter: Tim Irving **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 367 **Comment Id:** 351269 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In my view, the conclusions are outrageously slanted in favor of dogs and dog owners. Crissy Field is a heavily used urban park, closest to the largest concentration of the public. It naturally should favor use by pedestrians, who include small children, the elderly, disabled people. Your plan continues to put us at risk. I am outraged that dogs will be allowed in all areas and off-leash in some. The most sensible solution is to fence off a portion of the field for use by dogs .Crissy Field should have as is priority the enjoyment and safety of people not the absolute freedom of dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Rosiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 392 **Comment Id:** 351306 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I walk my dog off leash several times a week at the beach at Crissy Field. The walks keep me and my dog happy and healthy, and they also keep her tired and well behaved when we aren't at Crissy Field. Please help me and my dog stay happy & healthy by allowing us to use the open spaces we were promised to run free and enjoy the outdoors - the beautiful outdoor spaces make San Francisco special, and it would be nice if everyone were allowed to continue to enjoy them.

Organization:

Commenter: Mara Klein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 408 **Comment Id:** 351328 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I visit East Beach with my dog almost every day, rain or shine. We've been going there since he was 2 months old and now he's 26 mos. It's the highlight of our day and I love to watch him run with the other dogs he meets there. He's a rhodesian ridgeback and to watch him run in a wide open space is stunning. By limiting the amount of open beach and field, the assigned space will become dangerously crowded and probably unusable. Dogs need open space to run and trying to confine them will present hazards of both people dogs getting run into as well as ruining the enjoyment of visiting the beach field with your dog if it's too overcrowded to join.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 420 **Comment Id:** 351345 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I would like the GGNRA to have it put on record now that if you restrict so drastically the off leash areas in SF, over time dogs will become less socialized & THEN you may have a safety problem.

Organization:
Commenter: Chris A Eekhrtsbiers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 427 **Comment Id:** 351352 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please don't let the dogs ruin the beach, lagoon and stream areas. These should be off limits to dogs. It's such a wonderful place, the headlands, but small beach to have shit and piss all over. Check by your comment sign, there are two stinky piles. You can't trust the owners to be responsible. And who wants to be confronted, woken up, sand kicked on by a dog. Let the dogs go shit and piss on the trails, and have rangers there to give out stiff fines for the assholes who won't clean up. Does every beautiful park and beach have to be ruined by shit and piss; you dare not sit down anywhere. You are making parks toilets. The dogs don't care, they just want the stickiest place to poop; so keep them on the land trails, on leashes, and other less special places.
Organization:
Commenter: Larry Pruss **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 433 **Comment Id:** 351362 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please don't take our dog walking area away. It's saved my health both mentally and physically.
Organization:
Commenter: Shelley d Doran-Jose **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 437 **Comment Id:** 351369 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: GGNRA is an urban park serving a large community that loves the outdoors and nature. Banning people and/or dogs means less places people can exercise - which is good for people, dogs and the health of the community. Please please preserve our dog walking areas.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine Feist **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 449 **Comment Id:** 351386 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: After reviewing the range of alternatives, including the preferred alternative, I support Alternative A. All other alternatives failed to consider the impact limiting off-leash activity in our Natl. Recreation areas. If space is limited, more off leash dogs, walkers, and owners will be forced together creating increased conflict of dogs and people. The space limitation will cause an increase in dog fights and stress which leads to unwanted animal behavior. Off leash walking creates happy, healthy, and well adjusted dogs. Also it fosters happy athletic owners.

Organization:
Commenter: Leah King **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 455 **Comment Id:** 351393 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Science has shown that dogs help reduce stress in humans. Changing the current rules will make this far more difficult. Please allow us to continue to access the beautiful off-leash areas with our dogs. Please preserve the off leash spaces to allow us to continue as a positive, healthy community.
Organization:
Commenter: Amber Morey-Wu **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1012 **Comment Id:** 351431 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they werent supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Lawrence Skaggs **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1016 **Comment Id:** 351438 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am a disabled, retired middle-aged woman who feels safe in the presence of the dog community. My gait is unbalanced enough that trying to walk my dog on leash is relatively dangerous. Please stop seeing those of us who walk at the Fort or at Ocean Beach as the enemy. I stay on paths and can make it down to the beach on some days (wouldn't be able to do that if I was clinging onto a leash).
Organization:
Commenter: Lauris C Jensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1048 **Comment Id:** 351483 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also, it could force me, a woman, to walk in isolated areas that don't feel safe.
Organization:
Commenter: Colleen Russell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1069 **Comment Id:** 351522 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I go to Ocean Beach, Chrissy Field and Fort Funston regularly with my dog. We jogg for a few miles or hike for even more. These activities provides me great physical and emotional stimulation that I would not be able to experience in a small dog park or a restricted off-leash area. Please allow me, my family and friends to continue to make urban living sustainable by having easy access to these large park areas in the company of our off-leash dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Sona Aggarwal **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 483 **Comment Id:** 351768 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Hi there, I am in favor of restricting the ability of people to walk their dogs off-leash around other people and animals. It is more important that people feel safe, and are not attacked by dogs while out walking than it is to grant dog-owners the privilege to walk their dogs off-leash.
Organization:
Commenter: D Rich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 492 **Comment Id:** 351788 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am writing to urge you to disallow unleashed pets on hiking trails in the GGNRA. These animals can become a threat to hikers, children, and other animals, and dog attacks on trails can easily become a major issue. It is a small thing to leash a pet. It is a huge tragedy when an unleashed animal attacks and mauls a hiker, child, or pet.
Organization:
Commenter: Thom Morris **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1158 **Comment Id:** 351790 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Humans get much needed exercise too taking their pets to these larger parks that provide lots of walking/running/hiking for both dog and humans, Take this all away and we are left standing in small, overpopulated and heavily congested city parks.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A M N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 493 **Comment Id:** 351793 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Also of valid merit is the fact that this plan pays no consideration to the impacts

on the physical and mental health of both dogs and their owners if dog walking is this severely restricted.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 507 **Comment Id:** 351835 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Women feel more secure when walking with a dog on the trails. Michelle Obama is promoting healthy lifestyles for all Americans and walking with a dog encourages a healthy lifestyle.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Wilder **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 515 **Comment Id:** 351847 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Requiring leashes on the sand ladder at Ft. Funston is unsafe - its hard to keep my footing going down without a dog - Having a dog or 2 on leash pulling you is a serious safety issue

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 531 **Comment Id:** 351877 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Limiting trails that allow dogs creates more conflicts with park users who don't want to hike with dogs by condensing dogs in particular areas/trails

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 540 **Comment Id:** 351890 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Losing off-leash walking area at Crissy will have a great impact on both my health and that of my dog. We booth need to run free to stay healthy. We have no backyard so free recreation on public land is critical to a healthy urban life. I have lived in SF for 50 years and value the urban diversity that recognizes the unique needs of our city people and dogs

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1176 **Comment Id:** 351911 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: They need a place to get out pent-up energy - the children love to play with the

dogs there also. We don't need anymore agressive dog behavior - changing the present rules will have a great impact on this.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Jordan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1196 **Comment Id:** 351959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a senior citizen (81) I have walked my dog at F.F. almost daily since 1980. We as dog owners love F.F. do what we can to keep it safe. I feel if I did not have this place to walk exercise my dog, I would not have reached this age. I have a large dog that need to run fetch balls, at my age there is no way I could exercise him on a leash. Fort Funston has a large community of Senior Citizens who need to be able to walk their dogs off leash. It would be a mistake to limit areas at F.F. You will have more problems from non dog people who will destroy what ever they can.

Organization:

Commenter: Theresa Walker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1240 **Comment Id:** 352048 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The prospect of banning dogs in the GGNR is ridiculous, and unfair. It punishes those of us that keep our dogs on leash AND those of us (like myself) that have a physical condition where having a dog could be the difference between hazard & safety. I suffer from M.S. I hike using an ankle brace, two poles, and a knee brace. My dog is trained to pick up things I drop, help me regain my balance if I fall, and give me support when needed. To ban her from the trails is to ban me. Seems very biased against those with disabilities.

Organization:

Commenter: linda mannella **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1253 **Comment Id:** 352177 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose thus plan due to the lack of off leash dog areas and the ban on dogs from many trails. As single women it is a safety issue to have my dog and there are other ways to discourage irresponsible dog owners than a ban.

Organization:

Commenter: Rebecca L Jorgenson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1327 **Comment Id:** 352317 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Please keep dog access, so people will exercise their pooches and themselves , lowering costs for medications for diabetes, hypertension, and depression.

Organization: Service dog tutor

Commenter: Jean D Cary **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1340 **Comment Id:** 352358 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Having an off leash area to walk my dog in Golden Gate Park helps me have someplace to walk each day and helps maintain my health. I hope that you will consider off leash areas for walking my dog for my sake.
Organization:
Commenter: Claudia Zeiler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1358 **Comment Id:** 352392 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Allowing dogs only on Rodeo Beach would also have the unwanted effect of making that beach very, very densely used by dog owners, and would create a *dangerous* environment there for both people and dogs due to the extra chaos created by an overblown density of people and dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael L Myers **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1362 **Comment Id:** 352394 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dog behaviorists will inform you that off leash exercise is essential to the physical and behavioral health of all larger canines. Frankly, I was a bit surprised at the sheer number of dogs over 50# that daily attended Fort Funston. One might expect a few less, in an area so deficient in open space. It is well known that dogs greet each other best when left to their own devices, the act of restraining a dog, in the presence of another, can instigate violent behavior. The disparity in the numbers of bad incidents at Fort Funston, as opposed to those of Crissy Field seem to bear that out. We all know the damage to life and property that an out of control 75# dog can do... In the interest of public safety, the only logical course of action would be to leave a good thing alone.
Organization:
Commenter: Christopher F Norgaar **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1371 **Comment Id:** 352407 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Reducing the areas where dogs are free to be dogs will make it difficult for dog-owners in the Bay Area to exercise their dogs (and themselves), and this will result in (a) overcrowding of existing dog runs in the City parks, and (b) increased dog aggression since they will not be as tired and happy as they currently are.
Organization:
Commenter: Leora Goren **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1393 **Comment Id:** 352437 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs need to burn off their energy to remain balanced and well-behaved, and sometimes the only way their owners can help them do that is by letting them run off leash. I am not a marathon runner, but my dog is, and she needs more places - not fewer - where she can get proper space to run. If you cut back on off-leash areas in and around the city you will definitely start to see the results in the behavior of the under-exercised, unbalanced dogs who will begin to act out because they will no longer have proper outlets to expend their energy.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1419 **Comment Id:** 352520 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: One thing is certain: the consequence of sending southern Marin dog owners into their cars to walk their dogs someplace further afield would be more traffic, more fuel emissions, and less exercise for local residents. None of that is in keeping with the National Park Service's mission.
Organization:
Commenter: Kaitlin Quistgard **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 587 **Comment Id:** 352679 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dog waste also becomes a repulsive problem. And, though I love to see dogs chasing one another, this play can be hazardous for folks who are less steady on their feet and not expecting to be rushed or bumped by a passing dog. We should have some areas where this concern does not present itself.
Organization:
Commenter: Kristine E Fowler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 591 **Comment Id:** 352686 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I strongly support the ban on dogs and off-leash dog walking at the Racho Corral de Tierra location. It has gotten so bad that I do not feel comfortable bringing my children, ages 7 and 4, to that location. They have been harassed and almost bitten numerous times. When I nicely ask the dog owners to please keep their dogs on a leash, I am mostly ignored and occasionally threatened or verbally abused by the dog owner. This is not a tenable situation. I believe the choice has to be framed as to whether dog enjoyment of the open space is more important than human enjoyment of the open space.
Organization:
Commenter: Sean Handel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 618 **Comment Id:** 352744 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I am also concerned about the safety of children and people who are not comfortable around dogs. They have a right to enjoy areas of the park free of being barked at or jumped on by dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Marsha J Feinland **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2066 **Comment Id:** 352753 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: In addition, dogs provide safety on trails from persons whom might be a threat to an unsuspecting individual. There have been assault crimes reported over the years on these trails and our canine friends provide much needed safety where rangers cannot be present.
Organization:
Commenter: Doug MacIntosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 624 **Comment Id:** 352761 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I feel that uncontrolled dogs are a threat to children and the elderly. I certainly do not believe that dogs should be off leash in the Presidio.
Organization: California Native Plant Society
Commenter: Jean Conner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 635 **Comment Id:** 352786 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: This plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily ignores the needs of Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their canine companions. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.
Organization:
Commenter: Renee A Richards **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 639 **Comment Id:** 352797 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily ignores the needs of Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their dogs. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.
Organization:

Commenter: annie klebahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 654 **Comment Id:** 352832 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As it is now, dogs in large and small numbers pass each other on the streets, in the parks, on trails and on beaches, playfully, peacefully and naturally. They've figured it out. They are well exercised, social and socialized. With the proposed new and severe restrictions to significantly fewer areas where dogs can be at all, and almost no areas where they can be off-leash, these areas will become overcrowded, overrun and rundown. The increased tension of the gathering of higher concentrations of dogs in these limited spaces, having had substantially less exercise, can create conflicts and inevitably aggressive situations with grave repercussions.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Saxon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 663 **Comment Id:** 352852 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Unmanaged animals should not be allowed in any recreational area or trial. One reason is safety (Foster, 2006). When there are large groups of people and dogs, aggression from one animal toward another dog and/or human can result in injuries. Unmanaged animals without proper training and control may have more aggression and can play roughly, resulting in fights and injuries. They may also scare children and a parent or another adult may injure the dog, even if the dog did not physically harm the child.
Organization:
Commenter: Faith Wall **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1486 **Comment Id:** 352884 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not restrict dog walking or off leash areas, these areas are so important to our dogs and our community, espcially at crissy field. Dogs need a place to run free, this makes people happier and dogs more relaxed and well behaved when they are walking on the city streets or interacting with humans. it is so important for dogs to get a lot of exercise, and this will become extremely difficult, especially for disabled people or people who can not walk, for their dogs to get enough exercise. Please consider the dogs and the disabled dog owners.
Organization:
Commenter: alan l robin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1525 **Comment Id:** 353005 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We hear all the time how important it is to socialize dogs so the do not become dangerous threats. If the places that we socialize disapear how will anyone be able to do the right thing? Won't that increase the number reports of injury caused by dogs when they are in public.

Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Hopewell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 713 **Comment Id:** 353012 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Safety. I like my animal with me for safety reasons. My dog is a safety net for my solo walks. The Pacifica, CA police issued a statement that women should not walk alone after a single female hiker was annonymously videoed on a Montara Mountain trail.
Organization:
Commenter: Susan E Messner Whipp **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1549 **Comment Id:** 353077 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: This policy change is an unacceptable restriction on the lives of dog owners and dog walkers. There are more dogs than children in this city, and they depend on exercise for good behavior just like we do. Eliminating off-leash areas for dogs to run will result in higher bite incidents, more euthanasia of problem animals, and lower mental health for dogs and dog owners alike.
Organization:
Commenter: Gordon Rowe **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1573 **Comment Id:** 353139 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I love FF and my dog as well. If off leash areas are restricted as you plan, it will be overcrowded in the areas where we can actually keep them off leash. You set up problems, dog aggressions will increase.
Organization:
Commenter: Bettina N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1586 **Comment Id:** 353156 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: By restricting these parks, you are also limiting the amount of exercise pet owners get when they take their dogs for a walk. For example, the loop my husband and I walk at Fort Funston every day is just under two miles of various topography. In addition to it being a great workout, we love coming here WITH OUR OFF LEASH DOG, to take in the scenery (it never gets old).
Organization:
Commenter: Vivian Sakovich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 763 **Comment Id:** 353166 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am concerned about the small spaces provided for off-leash activity. I fear that it would force too many walkers and dogs into the limited spaces provided and a whole new range of problems would arise from the over-crowding. I feel that if such large areas were deemed off limits, some spaces should be created to off set the restrictions.

Organization: Dog Trot by Chris

Commenter: Chris Petersen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1618 **Comment Id:** 353187 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: And finally, such restrictions will not limit my ability to exercise but also force me to increase my use of car and gas, hence, it is bad for public health and for the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Emily Leproust **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1747 **Comment Id:** 353190 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: please consider the negative impact this will have on the lives of pet dogs and their owners. The off-leash policy currently encourages pet dogs and their owners to use the spaces frequently for the enjoyment of nature and for physical exercise. Restrictive changes to this policy will discourage people from using the spaces with regularity and diminish the quality of so many lives.

Organization:

Commenter: Carly Earnshaw **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2021 **Comment Id:** 353198 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: the health and well-being of our community will drastically suffer without proper dog-friendly recreation areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Lara McCaskill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2153 **Comment Id:** 353199 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: I just can't imagine our pets not getting the exercise they really need and receive from off leash walks. Can you imagine a city full of under exercised dogs and the problems that will cause!

Organization:

Commenter: Debbie Rutledge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1636 **Comment Id:** 353232 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: And finally, these restrictions will negatively impact my life and the life of my family, including my canine companion. I am a teacher who lives in the city and utilize the GGRNA to exercise and socialize. Limiting access to this facility for canines will limit my ability to keep my dog active and in good health.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2213 **Comment Id:** 353253 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: When you leash dogs, they become more aggressive and it is OUTRAGEOUS that Marin County would only offer ONE beach to exercise our dogs, and ourselves. Many studies show how important it is to humans to have dog companions and to restrict us with leash laws makes the experience unhealthy and more dangerous.

Organization:

Commenter: Lesa Kramer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 771 **Comment Id:** 353259 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Small children are often knocked over and sometimes bitten. The children and their parents and caretakers need to be able to enjoy our parks without worrying about run ins with aggressive canines.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 792 **Comment Id:** 353298 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: please restore balance to the golden gate nra by restricting dogs off leash. my wheelchair bound husband has been physically intimidated by dogs off leash on various occasions; owners either did not have dogs under control or appeared not to care. one owner was aggressive and hostile toward my husband when he asked her to control her dog.

Organization:

Commenter: kit cameron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3181 **Comment Id:** 353315 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: Our community's health and sense of well-being will be negatively affected by these restrictions, especially as there are no resources that can serve as substitutes for the GGNRA's walking/hiking trails and off-leash areas.

Organization:
Commenter: Teresa Goodman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 823 **Comment Id:** 353366 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs on leashes do NOT cause problems other than waste management. It has been my experience that Marin County dog owners are extremely conscientious about picking up their dog litter, and so what is the logic in the further restriction of dogs on our magnificent hills.
Organization:
Commenter: Sherry Thomas-Healy **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 847 **Comment Id:** 353410 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The generous off-leash areas in San Francisco are in fact an important safety valve, because dogs who are well exercised are almost never aggressive in more restrained situations like small city parks and sidewalks. Dogs who are never allowed off leash can become anxious and unpredictable, which is much more of a concern than dogs running free and relaxed in wide-open areas like Baker and Crissy Beaches.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1655 **Comment Id:** 353480 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Individuals who visit nature are healthier, both physically and emotionally, so discouraging people from public lands would directly impair the general health of society.
Organization:
Commenter: Anne Bell **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1678 **Comment Id:** 353548 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have been using the GGNRA almost daily to exercise myself and my dog. It is most important for both our continued well being.The proposed plan is far too restrictive. I have in my practice suggested that people acquire dogs to assure that they would participate in outdoor healthful activities. Please reconsider the restrictions for the health of many citizens besides myself. I urge you to maintain off leash areas as most dogs can be controlled without a leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Stuart Schwartz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 879 **Comment Id:** 353555 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Getting out and walking with your dog has been proven to increase mental and physical health. Reducing the places dogs can walk in the city, will increase stress, mental illness and physical ailments.

Organization:

Commenter: S. J Ong **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3729 **Comment Id:** 353598 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: s you know diabetes and a host of other health issues plague our country from lack of activity. What was once a rural county of farmers has shifted to urban desk workers and our health is at stake. Just like libraries were set up to establish low-costs way of educating Americans, parks need to accommodate our health. We all know that pets lower blood pressure and balance stress, but its much more than that. We are in a position to consider the evolution of the urban environment and we need to find balance that supports healthy lifestyles.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie C Edelman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1695 **Comment Id:** 353648 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Well-socialised and well-exercised dogs are happy and healthy dogs, who in turn are well-behaved dogs. My dog is a part of my family, and I take him with me when I go out. Why are we being asked to leave our well-trained and well-behaved dogs at home, rather than taking them out with us so that we all remain healthy?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1755 **Comment Id:** 353739 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose the current plan for many reasons: dogs kept on-leash are almost always more aggressive, dog fights are occurring more frequently in dog parks due to overcrowding(there was a near-fatal attack at the MV dog park last week.) as well as a place for being a vector for parasites,

Organization:

Commenter: Sharon Salisbury **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1756 **Comment Id:** 353741 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the

GGNRAs original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan FAILS to do.

Organization:

Commenter: Catherine Foreman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1769 **Comment Id:** 353754 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If GGNRA's Dog Management Plan is passed, the remaining off leash areas would become hazardously overcrowded. Their would be a huge increase in the number of under exercised and under socialized dogs, which only spells disaster and poses huge danger to EVERYONE. Under exercised and under socialized dogs are more likely to be out of control and the likelihood of them biting someone would be greatly increased.

Organization:

Commenter: Charles Nieman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 945 **Comment Id:** 353805 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This plan is not well thought out at all, and does not seem to take safety considerations into account. Dogs need safe designated areas in order to run off their excess energy (from being cooped up in houses, living in a metropolitan area) and to learn socialization skills in a non-threatening space. Dogs who do not get enough chance to run and play become nervous, making them aggressive with not only other dogs, but people as well.

Organization:

Commenter: Rebecca M Coolidge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2143 **Comment Id:** 353831 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: We would have to drive far distances to find appropriate areas to run off leash. And, my dog would have extra energy. Image all the dogs in the city with all that extra energy, this seems extremely dangerous to me.

Organization:

Commenter: Megan Synnestvedt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4745 **Comment Id:** 353845 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE

Comment Text: My dogs visit GGNRA lands at least 5 days a week, and those visits are critical to their health and vitality; not to mention my own. TAKING AWAY OUR ACCESS IS AN ACT OF CRUELTY; GGNRA FACILITIES ARE WHAT MAKES IT POSSIBLE TO HUMANELY KEEP A DOG IN THIS OVERCROWDED REGION.

Organization:

Commenter: Jacqueline Harlow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4753 **Comment Id:** 353846 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: If Fort Funston's off-leash recreation is prohibited or curtailed, the quality of my life will suffer dramatically. That's not an overstatement. Running my dogs at Fort Funston has been a large part of my enjoyment of San Francisco - - I go there to take exercise for myself and to visit with other dogs and dogs owners regularly.
Organization:
Commenter: Margaret E Murray **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4767 **Comment Id:** 353848 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: PLEASE CONSIDER that a good many people regard their dogs as family, and the exercise and rigor of off leash walks keep a great many in the Bay Area with marginal MENTAL HEALTH stable and engaged with the world in positive ways.
Organization:
Commenter: Jon Engdahl **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4769 **Comment Id:** 353849 **Coder Name:** MGAMBLE
Comment Text: And as a woman, often running alone, I feel safer with my dog by my side.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine M Malone **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 959 **Comment Id:** 354160 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: People aren't going to just get rid of their dogs if Alternative F is passed, and restricting all those existing dogs to such a small area is bound to create problems of over usage as well as dog conflicts. Additionally, dogs without sufficient exercise and freedom can be aggressive and are certainly not as happy or acceptable as well-cared for dogs who are allowed to have a reasonable amount of exercise and freedom.
Organization:
Commenter: Gail C High **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1823 **Comment Id:** 354262 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: YOU WILL HAVE MORE DOG-BITING ON YOUR HANDS IF YOU REMOVE THEIR RIGHTS .
Organization:
Commenter: philis bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1828 **Comment Id:** 354271 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed restrictions in GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan are severe, unwarranted, and oppressive to all responsible and law abiding dog owners and their pets. If implemented, these restrictions will severely compromise our ability to provide the necessary care to our pets. Any dog behaviorist will tell you that well socialized dogs are also critical for the safety of other people and animals as positive socialization mitigates fear based reactions. This is a health and safety issue for everyone.

Organization:

Commenter: Wade Crosson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1833 **Comment Id:** 354294 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Contrary to a statement in the Golden Gate National Parks Plan draft (p.34), dog parvovirus is species specific and NOT transmissible to humans, as human parvovirus is not transmissible to dogs, according to the CDC (http://www.cdc.gov/parvovirusB19/). Furthermore, E.coli is omnipresen5 and part of the natural bacterial fauna found in the intestines of all mammals. The strain that is hazardous to humans comes from contaminated beef, not dogs. There is NO evidence of E.coli from dogs causing any problem in humans.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 1834 **Comment Id:** 354302 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am near certain of the impact though; less active dogs, with pent up energy in a city with so many dogs = a lot more acting out, overcrowding of the few dog areas in the city and therefor more dog issues between dogs and with people. Restricting off leash areas just because will not be without ramifications; why do it????

Organization:

Commenter: Alan B Brisbon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1893 **Comment Id:** 354482 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a professional dog behaviorist and trainer who's lived and worked in San Francisco for over 15 years, I know from experience how important these areas are for our dogs' and people's health and well being. Dogs need to be able to run and play in large spaces and even trained in these spaces. Without proper exercise and training, almost all dogs will exhibit behavior issues. These behavior problems can be as minor as destruction of household items and mild separation anxiety to dangerous aggression towards other dogs and humans.

Organization:

Commenter: Beverly Ulbrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1982 **Comment Id:** 354645 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: And finally, this proposal creates the potential for many unplanned consequences for dogs, their owners, and for the entire local community. Dogs need exercise, and if they get less of it due to new complexity for their owners in accessing off-leash areas, I believe incidents of aggressive canine behavior will increase. Dogs need to walk and run, and if they are not given this opportunity, the pent-up energy is expressed in much less desirable ways.
Organization:
Commenter: Cedric Brehaut **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1983 **Comment Id:** 354646 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: LOSING ANY OFF LEASH SPACE IS A HARDSHIP AND WILL AFFECT MY HEALTH.
Organization:
Commenter: SUSAN F GEARHART **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1986 **Comment Id:** 354649 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Also there is no area in the city where there is as much real estate for off leash area. So now the much smaller proposed off leash areas will become way more crowded and there will be a greater chance of dog fights and injuries, and a greater chance of catching illnesses for the dogs as they are exposed to more dogs/germs in a smaller, more crowded space.
Organization:
Commenter: loretta j jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1997 **Comment Id:** 354664 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I would like to oppose the plan. Hiking in dog allowed area, especially off leash area, provides me with my weekly exercise. There are already too little parks on the peninsula that allows dog. Even less parks allow for off leash walking. If parks doesn't allow for dogs, I will have even less choice for exercising.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2009 **Comment Id:** 354679 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Please reconsider reducing areas for off leash dog play. I cannot adequately

exercise my dog if he must remain on a leash. I worry that the remaining off leash areas will become terribly over crowded that the dogs will become stressed and they won't be a safe place for exercise.

Organization:

Commenter: Mara Aaberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2014 **Comment Id:** 354686 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: By limiting the space for pets not only are we are building a community of unhealthy pets but we are also building a community of unhealthy people who rely on these sites to exercise, walk, and enjoy nature. San Francisco is becoming a city where there are more pets than children and we need these sites to cater to the needs of the pet owners and the pets.

Organization:

Commenter: Jacob M Aringo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2035 **Comment Id:** 354706 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I believe that dogs need to be on leashes for many safety reasons. First, their is human saftey, where little children can be overwhelmed by a huge dog streaking by off leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Jaime C Kooser **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2657 **Comment Id:** 354808 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you have a large population of dogs that are not allowed to be a true dog and enjoy this open space, you will have a large population of extremely frustrated dogs that could lead to aggressive behavioral problems.

Organization:

Commenter: Jami M Nadzam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2822 **Comment Id:** 354875 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog parks in SF are rare, too small and too far away, and the plan fails to account for how un-exercised dogs on crowded sidewalks and streets will pose far more harm to people than trained dogs playing in safe rural off-leash areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Katy Walden **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2903 **Comment Id:** 355189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there are thousands and thousands of us who walk our dogs every day to stay healthy & fit, with our dogs safely under control - dogs can & need to run around and walk way way further than humans - they NEED to be able to run around while we walk

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Janet Standen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2910 **Comment Id:** 355201 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred a.lter.native described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent people like myself from recreating with our dogs for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Kristin Kelly **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2929 **Comment Id:** 355227 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for the past 8 years.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Peter Olfe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2930 **Comment Id:** 355231 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The proposed policies have an adverse impact on the disabled and elderly, and on people that might not feel com fortable visiting our beautiful parks without their dogs in tow: for example women trying to exercise by themselves or simply going for a walk alone.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: karin mac donald **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3651 **Comment Id:** 355395 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Our pets need a place to run free off leash-.-.it's imperative for their health. Also, at a time when the country is facing a public health (obesity) crisis, our government entities should not be erecting barriers that make exercise less accessible.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Alexis Petrakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3671 **Comment Id:** 355590 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose the (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will directly affect my health and quality of life in negative ways. My dog and I take daily outings to public recreation locations including Ocean Beach, Ft. Funston, Lands End, the Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach, and others. If I were unable to exercise with my dog, my Type 1 diabetes would be much harder to manage and I would likely die much sooner as the result.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Gillian Ladd **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3890 **Comment Id:** 355636 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Take away this right and you will have animals with pent-up energy and aggression-.-.in other words, creating a new problem!
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Adrianne Bee **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2109 **Comment Id:** 355737 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I disagree with the premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area.
Organization:
Commenter: Denise F Selleck **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2141 **Comment Id:** 355784 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Too many dogs on a small territory would cause fights and wouldn't be safe for dogs and the dog walkers/dog parents.
Organization:
Commenter: Dominika Knossalla **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2151 **Comment Id:** 355801 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: GGNRA has already excluded dog access from more than 75% o the beaches, trails and open spaces. This has presumably helped protect wildlife but has also concentrated the dog activity into the remaining spaces. Further restriction will increase usage yet more making the remaining dog-friendly areas even more burdened and encourage scofflaws to take their dogs further afield.
Organization: individual

Commenter: John M Stiggelbout **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4206 **Comment Id:** 355979 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because in San Francisco more people own pets than have kids. It is vitally important for the health of the com munity to have off-leash dog areas. Both non-dog owners as well as dog owners benefit from having healthy dogs who are well socialized in the com munity.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Dori Melton **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4461 **Comment Id:** 355996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is exclusive and discriminative towards these animals. A drastic 90% dcrease in recreation space available greatly affects the well-being of both animals and owners.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Hillary Acer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4473 **Comment Id:** 356012 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252).
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Theresa Gaydon **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5354 **Comment Id:** 356020 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because having a safe place for dogs to be prevents them from congregating in less safe areas.
Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco
Commenter: Robert Baron **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2240 **Comment Id:** 356857 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Designated dog parks for off leash use are a benefit to our society as it is a place for a large group of our population to congregate and enjoy the outdoors with our fellow neighbors. Removal of such a place will lead to increased issues with dog walkers on confined sidewalks and increased issues with dog waste on sidewalks.

Organization:

Commenter: Isaac West **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2607 **Comment Id:** 356868 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: With only 1% o GGNRA lands dedicated to off-leash access, further restricting off-leash access can only offer small (if any) gains versus the enormous impact to the 10,000 dog visitors per day, the health of dog owners whose primary exercise is walking their dogs, and the subsequent overcrowding of city dog areas, insufficient dog exercise and socialization which will lead to further overcrowding of abandoned dog shelters

Organization:

Commenter: art gallagher **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2615 **Comment Id:** 356882 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who lives in the city of San Francisco and walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Adam French **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2638 **Comment Id:** 356959 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I grew up riding the GGNRA with a horse, and parents allowed us to ride alone because one of the girls had a dog following us everywhere for safety. The dog would have warned us of danger, scared away predators, or gone for help if something would have happened. This would not be possible if dogs are not allowed to accompany their owners.

Organization: DotGreen Foundation

Commenter: Annalisa M Roger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2647 **Comment Id:** 356986 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA (specifically Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara), I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the

preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on this property for many, many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Deborah Mortensen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2648 **Comment Id:** 356988 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I was just wondering where are we going to walk our dogs off-leash if this passes. If everyone has to go to the small, enclosed off-leash areas around the city, then one is asking for an awful amount of trouble...both between dogs and owners

Organization:

Commenter: Mark Sedgwick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2671 **Comment Id:** 357026 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The PA would significantly and adversely impact the way we have been using GGNRA areas for both fun and health, for all three of us, for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Armstrong **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2732 **Comment Id:** 357151 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Douglas Bentz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2753 **Comment Id:** 357194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For many local dog guardians, especially seniors and others who find it difficult exercise their pets while on-leash, the GGNRA is the only place where they can let their dogs play and release a lot of energy. As the SF SPCA can attest, daily exercise is essential to a dog's proper health and well-being. Exercise affects a dog's behavior, trainability and aggression levels, which are important to properly maintaining public safety in crowded urban environments. Take away off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA, and dog guardians may be unable to meet the physical and mental needs of their pets (also at a detriment to their own healthy, active lifestyles).

Organization: San Francisco SPCA

Commenter: Brandy Kuentzel **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2275 **Comment Id:** 357295 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Walking with my dog makes me feel safer and as a senior citizen I am a potential victim of crime. Walking with my dog gives me needed recreation.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Sheats **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2765 **Comment Id:** 357388 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I live at Ocean Beach in San Francisco, and I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Jacob K Lesnik **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2770 **Comment Id:** 357416 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a proud long-time San Francisco resident and someone who walks regularly with my dog at Ocean Beach, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is shortsighted, restrictive, and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and the health of my community the way I have on GGNRA properties for over ten years.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2783 **Comment Id:** 357447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The proposed GGNRA restrictions on off leash dog walking will have a severe impact on my dogs and the health and happiness of my pets and my family.
Organization:
Commenter: alison lufkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2786 **Comment Id:** 357472 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If it were not for my dog, I would not get out and get this exercise nor would my dog. These are the only places in the Bay Area where we can run, play ball, splash in the ocean. The NPS changes will seriously impact the physical and mental health of countless people

and their pets as well as the livelihoods of those who make their livings working with dogs outdoors.

Organization: Dog City Tours

Commenter: Ellen N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2792 **Comment Id:** 357483 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to express my sadness about and opposition to the alternatives laid out in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying recreation time with my dog for my own health as I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Cunningham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2808 **Comment Id:** 357528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We enjoy taking our dog the off leash to join other dogs in play. Without these options I worry his health as well as ours will be impacted by limiing play in off leash areas to small areas and with the potential for overcrowding

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2818 **Comment Id:** 357551 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Andrea B **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2873 **Comment Id:** 357705 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Any reduction to on or off-leash dog areas will only result in the remaining areas getting more crowded. In turn, this will only worsen any conflicts or incidents. For the record, although GGNRA/NPS claims to want to reduce such conflicts, it appears they in fact want to increase the likelihood of such incidents so they can then use these incidents as grounds for yet further reductions until they achieve their backhanded goal of minimizing dog access.

Organization: SaveOffLeash.com

Commenter: Samir Ghosh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3090 **Comment Id:** 357895 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If you take these areas away from dog owners, so many problems will turn up...the parks will be over-crowded...there will, as a result, be more incidents involving dogs and people...dogs and dogs, etc. I don't own a dog, but I do not want to have to deal with these new issues of over-crowding.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3185 **Comment Id:** 357957 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As a service-connected (disability rated) Vietnam veteran, I have found that this has improved my quality of life immensely and decreased my PTSD. Not only is the physical exercise beneficial to me and my dog, so is the ability to socialize with other dog owners and frequently other veterans who are dog owners. Please don't take this capability away from us as it will have a major negative effect on our quality of life. Please reconsider your proposed changes.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard Milner **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3214 **Comment Id:** 357989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please save off leash dog areas. The most dangerous dogs are those with pent up energy due to not getting enough exercise and that energy getting redirected in the form of aggression. Restricting off leash will therefore create more dangerous dogs
Organization:
Commenter: Petra Steen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3357 **Comment Id:** 358229 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It has been a recreational, energizing and healthy time for us, also rewarded by the resulting socialization with neighbors and the community.This has been the character of our region. As such, again I'm expressing my concern and opposition to the 'preferred alternative' described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.It is frighteningly restrictive and would prevent me and my dog from many years of the healthy recreation, enjoyed over so many years.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3378 **Comment Id:** 358290 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: According to your own statistics, dog incidents account for such a small percentage of the problems. To funnel dogs to smaller and smaller areas is a sure way to cause problems.

Organization:

Commenter: pam herz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3389 **Comment Id:** 358309 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The new restriction would limit that access to my dog and the many dogs in the area, forcing their owners to walk their animals in more densely populated areas where problems between dogs and other recreation users could arise.

Organization:

Commenter: Molly Hartle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2389 **Comment Id:** 358885 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: If off leash usage of the GGNRA's land is severely restricted by dogs and their owners as proposed, there will also be an negative impact on dog/dog and dog/human interactions. Namely, when dogs are able to exercise, socialize, and play off leash, there are fewer attacks, fights, and bites. This fact is certainly supported by the comments made by researchers and veterinarians. Is the irresponsible change proposed by the GGNRA going to result in more injuries.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert I Kahn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2394 **Comment Id:** 358893 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support requiring leashes for dogs. Although many are well-behaved, about 10% ae out of control - - jumping on people, harrassing other dogs, and definitely not under any voice command. It's unsafe and it creates a tense atmosphere for everyone else. The safety and comfort of *people* need to come above that of dogs or their owners; and the safety of protected local species needs to have priority over stir-crazy dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2483 **Comment Id:** 358985 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: vast areas of land and the beaches of this beautiful coast are not just for humans to enjoy. Animals, specifically dogs, are a part of our lives and our families. This will be a detriment to the active lifestyles that so many Californians lead. In terms of the health of the

animals, it is a proven fact that problems arise with dogs that are cooped up and have no outlet to run free. If this plan is enacted it will be the core reason for a multitude of new problems.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2507 **Comment Id:** 359006 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Limiting the number the number of dogs per walker is important to public safety and, potentially, to protecting the Park against liability. However, a large pack (and most dog walkers have 8 or more dogs) may have two or more aggressive dogs, and when that happens they behave like a hunting pack, circling an individual so that only one dog can be faced at a time. Furthermore, a group of dogs will behave far more aggressively than an individual. All of this is in addition to the difficulty of controlling a large group. The current sizes of dogs groups with a single walker make the park experience risky and unpleasant for other users, and frequently for other dog walkers.

Organization:

Commenter: John P Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2517 **Comment Id:** 359017 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please leave the Off Leash areas as they are. If you must change them, add MORE space for off leash exercise and play. According to a study reported by the American Psychological Assoc, people with pets are happier, healthier and better adjusted than those without. Pets and people need exercise to get to or maintain a healthy body and mind. What better exercise than going to the beach to walk and run around. San Francisco is currently constructing a lot of condos and apartments, many of which will allow pets. City parks are already crowded and the GGNRA areas are a great place to go to lessen the crowds. Please DO NOT take away the off leash areas

Organization: Dolores Park Dogs

Commenter: Jill D Inderdohnen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2557 **Comment Id:** 359080 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I support the Preferred Alternative because I am tired of chasing away off-leash dogs that approach my family. My son has been attack by off-leash dogs at his school, which does not allow off leash pets of any kind. As a child I was also attacked by an off-leash dog at a park. Large pets and all dogs should be leashed in public areas at all times, excepted for designated off-leash areas. Protect our families, not the dog owners that think they are entitled because they bought a dog and did not have an adequate private yard for their pet.

Organization:

Commenter: John Weerts **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2564 **Comment Id:** 359092 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs make walkers and hikers feel safe providing motivation to exercise: On more than one occasion my dog and I have been approached by coyotes on Mori trail. We have also encountered people camping/sleeping in the bushes. Having my dog with me makes me feel safe and provides additional motivation.

Organization:

Commenter: A C **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2594 **Comment Id:** 359133 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I believe that the parks should provide a safe environment for all of its users. The US Parks are NOT A DOG PARK. Dog feces on beach are a serious health hazard (and disgusting), especially at the beach where children and adults are barefoot. Additionally dogs are a hazard to wild life.

Organization:

Commenter: Henry Gunst **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3417 **Comment Id:** 359151 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It has been scientifically proven that owning a dog increases your lifespan! Numerous studies have shown that dog ownership lowers your blood pressure, encourages exercise, decreases stress and loneliness, lowers your cholesterol and thus enhances your health. Dogs can sniff out some forms of cancer and recognize early signs of seizures, enabling them to warn their human companion to lie down to prevent injury. Additionally dogs can be trained to be a Certified Therapy Dog and and you can partner up with your dog and volunteer your services visiting sick patients in the hospital or troubled children in school. Animal-assisted therapy is designed to improve the physical, social, emotional and/or cognitive functioning of the patient, as well as providing educational and motivational effectiveness for participants. The experience is incredibly rewarding.

Organization:

Commenter: Lindsay C Kefauver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3419 **Comment Id:** 359154 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have walked at Crissy Field for almost 30 years and have always been uneasy about unleashed dogs on the east beach. In warmer weather, and low tides, lots of toddlers enjoy wading in the shallows. Lots of dogs also enjoy dashing around either in search of a ball or just for the hell of it. It is a bad combination. On the west beach, that is not a problem. There may be children enjoying the beach but generally they are up toward the grassy dunes and not in the water, which along that shore is not shallow enough for them to invite play. The Park service plan to allow off-leash dogs on the Crissy west beach makes sense, but not, of course, in the

snowy plover's protected breeding area. Off-leash dogs have never made sense to me on the east beach- -a serious dog-toddler encounter waiting to happen, usually due to the dog's admittedly delightful exuberance. The two just don't belong together on that beach. Moreover, once the dogs are given unleashed freedom on the east beach, they are much more likely at low tide to go under the foot bridge over the lagoon's outlet into the Bay and chase the many birds that feed and spend time there. Behavior I have seen a number of times. The calls of the owner are to no avail. Keep unleashed dogs off East Crissy Field Beach

Organization: Dolphin Club, SF International Ocean Film Festival

Commenter: Sidney J Hollister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3428 **Comment Id:** 359210 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: There are no off leash areas in San Mateo county so We really enjoy going to Fort Funston and Crissy Field. We have been going there for years and am very sad that most of the land will be taken away for off leash dog walking. We have 2 very active dogs that require running space. When you limit the areas there will be very close encounters with people and dogs that probably will cause many confrontations and problems. Our exercise will also be limited which doesn't help our well being.

Organization:

Commenter: Sylvia M Samuolis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3625 **Comment Id:** 359264 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There are already too few areas within the GGNRA in which dogs can be walked off leash. Off leash walking is necessary to the health of the dogs and their human companions who live in the Bay Area. If off leash walking within the GGNRA is further restricted as proposed, it is less likely that dogs will be able to run free. As a result, they may become anxious, stressed and agressive while on leash. This is not good for the human community.

Organization:

Commenter: Eleanor M Roman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3780 **Comment Id:** 359594 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: public safety and health are currently at serious risk by the misuse of our parks by dogs, dog owners, and dog walkers. The general condition of our parks and continued beneficial use by people with children also is at risk. In short, the parks are being used as glorified dog runs and toilets at the expense of the general public, and most particularly children

Organization:

Commenter: Lex F. and Bobbi Lynn Campbell and Jones **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4019 **Comment Id:** 359872 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Please keep option A. I am dismayed at how our liberties are getting more and more limited. Governments at every level are trying to get us to live straight-jacketed lives. I don't own a dog. But watching dogs run freely nurtures me; they have so much joy it is contagious. Humans need some places that are not inundated with restrictive laws. Everyone is so stressed. They need an outlet. Taking a walk or run with your dog on undeveloped land is a total stress release.

Organization:

Commenter: Carolyn Alter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3805 **Comment Id:** 359881 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: She plays there with the other dogs, runs along the beach, and splashes in the ocean. It's crucial for her to get this exercise and to socialize with other dogs. Not having this outlet truly scares me, because too much pent up energy never makes for a safe situation.

Organization:

Commenter: Leah D Wanta **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4027 **Comment Id:** 359967 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Restricting off-leash access to only a few beaches (is Rodeo Beach the only one?) will cause Rodeo Beach to be overwhelmed with dog owners seeking off-leash beach access for their dogs. It will inevitably result in significant increases not only in the numbers of dogs there, but also conflicts among dogs, dog waste, and other undesirable effects of so many dogs in a small area. In effect, it would turn Rodeo Beach into a "dog concentration camp". Contrary to one of the stated purposes of the Plan, it is likely to INCREASE USER CONFLICTS at Rodeo Beach. This can benefit no one.

Organization:

Commenter: Alan B Mullendore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3941 **Comment Id:** 360107 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The greatly increased restrictions and limited access in the proposed Dog Management Plan would have serious negative consequences to the quality of life of the people and dogs that these parks are supposed to serve.

Organization:

Commenter: Cynthia Cook **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3953 **Comment Id:** 360130 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Z **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3958 **Comment Id:** 360187 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: 50% o SF households have a dog and restricting us to such a small area will not allow me to exercise and play with my dog for his health, and mine, in a way that is enjoyable for us

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth Tausend **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4509 **Comment Id:** 360454 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have a dog who helps me through my medical issues and having no space to share with him where he can run and be happy, socializing with people and animals, is not a fair and equitable situation for the many tax paying dog lovers in our cities.

Organization:

Commenter: Austen Eddy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4529 **Comment Id:** 360481 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If you continue to push dog owners in to smaller and smaller off-leash locations several things will likely happen. First, as your force the concentration of dogs to higher and higher numbers in these areas, the negative repercussions will increase. To limit damage by dogs and high foot traffic, INCREASING the space available thereby decreasing the concentration of foot traffic will minimize damage. You are doing the exact wrong thing to protect people and the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4533 **Comment Id:** 360488 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Having safe off-leash areas for our four-legged companions is crucial to this city. Such areas draw people to SF, and allow recreational activities that happen to be enjoyed by people and their pets. Please understand how life-changing it would be to so many SF residents that it would significantly lower the quality of life for many.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4535 **Comment Id:** 360490 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please do not change the amount of open and off leash space. It would decrease or almost eliminate something that enriches my life and my dogs' lives so much. We utilize these open spaces for socialization and exercise every week.
Organization:
Commenter: Jessica M Stanton **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4058 **Comment Id:** 360583 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: A second argument referencing the needs for children (under 18 years of age), and elderly (60 years of age and older), or disadvantaged in any way whatsoever, should be foremost when weighing preferences or "needs" of those responsible for dogs in public spaces.
Organization: WILLIAM HAMMOND HALL SOCIETY
Commenter: Barton Mayhew **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4604 **Comment Id:** 361131 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Walking a dog in the beautiful outdoors is a healthy activity for pets and their owners. It is part of the daily routine for many dog owners, who gather so their dogs can play together and meet both social and physical needs.
Organization:
Commenter: Kathy N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4626 **Comment Id:** 361146 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks 3-4 times a week with my dog, Dante, at Ocean Beach I think your plan for the GGNRA is wrong. It prevents both my dog, my girlfriend and myself from getting much needed exercise, the way we have since we got our dog. Before we got him we barely got out.
Organization:
Commenter: Michael Ageno **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4635 **Comment Id:** 361152 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It is so important for the mental health of both dogs and their companions. To take away this opportunity for people and their companions will have detrimental health effects that are bad for both the dogs and their humans. I often suggest that women get dogs to walk

with for their health for safety and companionship to get them outside and moving.

Organization:

Commenter: Penelope J Fetsch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4644 **Comment Id:** 361165 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: John Delaplane **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4693 **Comment Id:** 361343 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, off-leash dogs near playgrounds can be dangerous to our small, toddling children and I believe a safe-distance perimeter would be helpful so children can also enjoy the grassy areas and not be in fear of getting knocked over by a dog chasing a ball.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4731 **Comment Id:** 361405 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: What I do know if that if this plan goes through and dogs do not get exercise and then flood the small parks we can expect the following; more bites and injuries for dogs and humans, increased euthanasia, more dogs begin abandoned at the shelter, decreased health benefits for people that cannot safely walk their dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: caroline beeler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4771 **Comment Id:** 361486 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, you also are very aware that small, fenced dog runs are very dangerous for most dogs, and only open park areas - where dogs can easily be distant from dangerous people (and other hazards) are safe. Removing the ONLY open parkland from use by families with dogs puts all dogs in San Francisco in danger.

Organization:

Commenter: Jeff Weinberger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4778 **Comment Id:** 361511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Dog Management Plan to further restrict areas where dogs are currently permitted in the GGNRA will discourage people from 1) exercising in these beautiful areas, and 2) will cause people to be less supportive of maintaining these areas.

Organization:

Commenter: T B **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4785 **Comment Id:** 361524 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It will prevent me and the thousands of other responsible people who enjoy recreating with their dogs in the GGNRA from doing so, thus negatively impacting our own mental and physical health and the health of our dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Laurie Berk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4790 **Comment Id:** 361536 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am writing to express the strongest possible opposition to the new GGNRAs draft dog management plan. I have lived in SF with dogs for more than 25 years, and I exercise my dogs in different parts of the GGNRA on a daily basis. The new plan is draconic, needlessly restrictive, and will make it incredibly difficult for me and my dogs to exercise and enjoy the outdoors as we have been doing for over two decades.

Organization:

Commenter: Glen Kretmar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4795 **Comment Id:** 361548 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Being able to exercise in a natural area with their dog off leash provides a vital benefit both physically and mentally for people and their dogs. If off leash dog walking is restricted many of these people will no longer be able to get this benefit.

Organization:

Commenter: Kenji Okamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4799 **Comment Id:** 361557 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: A large population of cooped up dogs is good for no one. Unable to socialize and exercise, bad things are more likely to happen than good. Once that happens, I worry the dog owners will also be blamed.

Organization:

Commenter: Ben Dutro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4824 **Comment Id:** 361601 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a woman I greatly enjoy the peace of mind of being able to hike solo on trails with a dog by my side. This is one of my most treasured activities. Without my dog along I do not feel comfortable alone on hikes, and I know there have been cases of women being harassed and attacked on trials. Limiting dog friendly trials even further also limits my own access and enjoyment of the outdoors.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4840 **Comment Id:** 361618 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a resident of San Francisco's Lower Pacific Heights for the past 14 years, and a dog-owner for the past 9, I am writing to strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Lisa N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4872 **Comment Id:** 361666 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Table 5 shows that over an 11 year period, there were a total of 4,932 reported dog-related incidents out of a total of 45,700 total incidents over this period. This is approximately 11 percent of total incidents and averages about 450 per year. Figure 5 presents the annual visitation to the GGNRA from 1973 to 2011. Looking at years 2001 - 2011, visitation at the GGNRA is approximately 14.5 million visitors per year. This equates to about 3 dog incidents per 100,000 visitors per year or 0.003 percent per year. This is substantially less than approximate 1-2 percent of dog incidents in the United States (Centers for Disease Control and US Census Bureau). Dog-related incident data for the 11 year period for on- and off-leash dogs at GGNRA, which is especially dog-friendly, shows that these incidents are substantially less than national averages.

Organization:

Commenter: Lynne Srinivasan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4874 **Comment Id:** 361675 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs are family and they need to exercise and socialize in open, safe and large areas. Restricting exercise and socialization to limited contained spaces will increase the risk of dog fights and make those areas unfit for good use due to the shear volume of dogs in one area.

Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4882 **Comment Id:** 361687 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting off-leash activities to small defined areas causes many problems, including dog fights since the pooches lack adequate personal space. In addition, small "dog parks" generally force needless congestion causing excessive terrain damage due to non-dispersed foot and paw traffic.
Organization:
Commenter: Kurt N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4883 **Comment Id:** 361698 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Law enforcement issues are minor. As the Park Service well knows, the number of dog-related incidents is extremely low, with reports showing a total of six dog bites throughout the entire GGNRA during 2013, among hundreds of thousands of visitors. While a dog bite is a serious matter regardless of how few occur, the Park Service currently has the authority to restrict dogs that do not respond to voice command. Furthermore, a leash is no guarantee that a dangerous dog will not bite a stranger.
Organization:
Commenter: Richard Springwater **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4944 **Comment Id:** 361804 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have read the report carefully, and I have not found any evidence in the report that shows the planned change in policy will reduce the number of dog bites. Does the park service have any statistical data reporting the incidence of dog bites for the two scenarios being compared (present rules or revised rules)? Without such data, I don't believe that there is a reasonable basis for expecting the proposed policy change to reduce the incidence of dog bites.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4945 **Comment Id:** 361808 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It would also force large numbers of dogs into the small, already crowded city parks to try to exercise. We know that problems occur when too many dogs/people are crowded into too small a space.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4961 **Comment Id:** 361847 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In this addendum, I would like to reiterate the importance of ensuring all dogs that use GGNRA are licensed in the owners' county of residence. This is a very important from a public and canine health and safety perspective.It is important because licensing helps to prevent the transmission of disease and rabies from dog to people and from dog to dog. A dog can only receive its annual license if it has received certain inoculations such as rabies. Assuming the dog's license is current; if the licensed dog were to bite a person, the transmission of rabies would be non- existent.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A Rowinski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5002 **Comment Id:** 361913 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If the claim of dogs compromising visitor safety were true, then there proposal should reflect such impact. In other words, why would they allow dogs to be in the areas of Ocean Beach that are more highly populated with humans. If this claim were justified then they should allow dogs to be where most humans are not. Yet their proposal restricts the areas of Ocean Beach to the areas where there is easy access, parking lots and known use by the majority of those that visit the beach. Why place the highest population of people in close proximity to the one thing they claim is compromising their safety?

Organization:

Commenter: Cyntha Mott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361987 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Regarding safety, the plan states that the cumulative impacts for Alternative A are the same as for Alternative F: Negligible. To conclude, page 1085, Muir Beach receives heavy visitation by beachgoers and walkers on the weekends and moderate to high use on the weekdays. Overall, the number of leash law violations is low for this site, with only nine occurring in 2008 through 2011; no dog bites or attacks were reported during this period (table 9). So why the concern over safety?

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5005 **Comment Id:** 361988 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have concern over being on trails without my dogs and feeling unsafe due to predators, both animal and human.

Organization:

Commenter: Coleen Curry **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5044 **Comment Id:** 362108 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am for off leash areas for dogs because it gives my dog appropriate space and atmosphere to socialize. When on leash my dog is more defensive and less susceptibility to have 100% psitive interactions. He has NEVER had a negative experience with another dog off leash at fort funston. Without these areas I believe that there will be higher aggression rates
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5075 **Comment Id:** 362156 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: If dogs are restricted from running and socializing and getting their energy out, they can go stir crazy and their frustration can make everyone around them sad and frustrated too. I think that the risk is great that the issues some people have with dogs will get worse if they are unable to get the proper exercise they need.
Organization:
Commenter: Z Meherali **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5106 **Comment Id:** 362189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Tara A Medve **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5110 **Comment Id:** 362193 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Small, fenced dog runs are very dangerous for most dogs, and only open park areas - where dogs can easily be distant from dangerous people (and other hazards) are safe. Removing the ONLY open parkland from use by families with dogs puts all San Franciscans - human and canine - in danger.
Organization:
Commenter: Lauren Hauptman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4224 **Comment Id:** 362232 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Also from the Fort Funston analysis "Impacts to health and safety would be

long-term, moderate to major, and adverse for the noaction alternative, long-term, minor to moderate, adverse for alternatives C, D, E, and the preferred alternative F, and long-term, minor, and adverse for alternative B." It is common knowledge that Fort Funston was a hang-out for drug use and sales prior to it becoming popular for dog walkers. As anyone knows who has significant experience at Fort Funston, this is an overstatement and is not supported by the analysis.

Organization:

Commenter: G K Webb **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4249 **Comment Id:** 362321 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: For all of the GGNRA, this data amounts to a total of 2 dog bites each month, or only about 25 each year. Elsewhere, the report states that there are 4.5 million dog bites throughout the US each year (more than one dog bite for every 100 citizens). For comparison, the GGNRA is immersed in San Francisco, with a population of almost 1 million, represents 1 in 300 of the of the average US population. If the average incidence of dog bites in San Francisco was an appropriate fraction of the 4.5M bites in the US every year, we would be suffering more than 15,000 dog bites per year in San Francisco. If only 25 of the 15,000 dog bites suffered in and around San Francisco were taking place within the GGNRA, the data suggests that these environments are actually much safer for people than other places in the city and in the US. In this report, the occurrence of 95 dog bites in 4 years is cited many times as evidence of a need for a change in policy. I actually think this data indicates that THE PRESENT POLICY IS EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE at minimizing dog bites. I see no evidence suggesting that a change is needed. Furthermore, this lengthy report provides no data comparing parks with comparable numbers of visitors and different dog-walking policies to prove that the proposed policies will have the desired impact on the incidence of dog-related attacks. Instead of using evidence, the report makes an argument, based solely on the report of 96 dog bites in 4 years that a change in policy is needed. Then, the GGNRA proposes a specific set of policy changes that, according to their own data, seems likely to increase the number of attacks and bites.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4269 **Comment Id:** 362342 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: am writing to support the new policy to restrict off-leash dog walking. The behavior of dogs at GGNRA beaches is not only disruptive to the enjoyment of the area but is also threatening and potentially hazardous to people, especially children.

Organization:

Commenter: Harold Ball **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4289 **Comment Id:** 362357 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Use of the open space is critical to the health and well being of my dogs and my family - small backyards which are common in CA are prohibitive to exercise and walking on the street doesn't provide the same amount of exercise, pleasure or safety measures for the dogs or the people walking the dogs. Rancho Corral provides the perfect opportunity for dogs and their owners to get the exercise they need in a safe environment. It also allows for social interaction for owners and their dogs which is critical to the mental well being of both. We have met such wonderful people and neighbors through walking our dogs at Rancho which has enhanced our day to day living and allowed us to feel safe and secure in our community. All of this is truly invaluable.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5227 **Comment Id:** 362713 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If there is a problem with dogs within the GGNRA, the NPS dog incident data should contain a record of the issues. Between 2001 and 2011, the GGNRA recorded 4,932 dog-related incidents, or 448/year or less than two per day across all 80,000 acres and 24 dog sites in the GGNRA. The GGNRA sees over 13,000,000 visitors per year and yet only records 448 incidents per year. This is hardly indicative of a problem, and in fact proves that the 1979 Pet Policy works.

Organization:

Commenter: David Nielsen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5273 **Comment Id:** 362851 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: By significantly reducing the off-leash dog areas, we will undoubtedly over time see an increase in aggressive dog behavior. Dogs need to be exercised, and more importantly, well socialized. The off leash dog parks allow for this to occur.

Organization:

Commenter: Lori Pryt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362861 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS does not demonstrate that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. It states that in the last year, out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher which reveals that these dog-related incidents are negligible and do not support a change in management.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362862 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The FSEIS must address the impacts to visitor and recreationalist safety from the NPS's proposals to crowd dogs into smaller spaces surrounded by fences.
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5271 **Comment Id:** 362863 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm very disturbed to see that leashes are still being proposed for the sand ladder at Fort Funston. I raised this serious safety concern at the DEIS stage and it has not been corrected in the SEIS. Footing is very difficult to keep walking down the unmaintained sand ladder, which is sometimes composed of stair logs in the air, with the sand underneath having eroded away. The stair then moves when one steps on it, and having a dog pulling on a leash will surely result in falls and injuries. I have found it hard to keep footing just walking without a leashed dog in this location.
Organization:
Commenter: Karen Vitulano **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5291 **Comment Id:** 362895 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 30 years.
Organization:
Commenter: Natala Menezes **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5294 **Comment Id:** 362907 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason and Fort Funston for many years.
Organization:
Commenter: Anna Hogan **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5303 **Comment Id:** 362926 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The alternative plans offered for on and off lead dog areas are at best disingenuous, and at worst dangerous. You provide a range of concepts from near total prohibition to such restrictive ideas that at their best restrict and confine the current numbers of dog owners now frequenting the open space into tight concentrations of such high density that issues of sanitation, overcrowding of trails, canine territorial disputes, and most simply put, a miserable environment that discourages access.

Organization:

Commenter: Dan Kaljian **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5349 **Comment Id:** 363000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is critical to the emotional and physical health of dogs to be able to exercise fully. This is rarely possible on leash or in small postage stamp sized "dog areas" If dogs are not given adequate exercise they are prone to more physical health problems. More importantly they often exhibit more behavior problems that affect people. As a veterinarian of 30 years I can tell you that dogs that need exercise and do not get it are more likely to have aggression related issues, including dog bites. I am concerned that if you do you not continue to provide space for dogs to run you will see an increase in the incidence of dog related problems.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Bouchard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5427 **Comment Id:** 363213 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I exercise my dog on Crissy Field/Fort Mason and Ocean Beach daily and our walker takes her to Baker Beach and Fort Funston. There would be very few places in the city where she (and I) would get sufficient exercise if this plan were implemented, and roaming the beaches and parks is one of the reasons I love living in San Francisco.

Organization:

Commenter: Anna Fabiano **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5431 **Comment Id:** 363221 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: They have to take their dogs somewhere to exercise them. I foresee many, many people using areas such as small city parks to run their dogs; areas where dogs have either always been banned or only allowed on-leash. Perhaps the powers that be see this as a new revenue source for issuing tickets to such offenders? I also see many more aggressive dog issues as people are forced to use smaller, congested designated dog parks; areas that are frequently used by owners that are either ignorant of the need, or are just too lazy to provide proper supervision

Organization:

Commenter: Stef Meinhardt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5443 **Comment Id:** 363268 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I strongly oppose the preferred alternative in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I regularly take my dog to Crissy Field and other GGNRA areas. My dog Olive loves to run and play fetch off leash. She is very well behaved and responsive to verbal commands, so is never in danger of harming off-trail wildlife. Depriving her of and I of this activity is a major blow to each of us and our respective physical and mental health.
Organization:
Commenter: Lauren T Gehman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5474 **Comment Id:** 363337 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Our dogs need "off leash" exercise for everyone's sanity and safety. If they don't get it you will probably see a rise in biting incidents. Because dogs, like humans, get a little loopy without running. Please do not lessen our ability to exercise our dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Robert Ficarro **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5522 **Comment Id:** 363896 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: The majority of dog behavioral issues stem from lack of exercise. Banning the ability for a dog to run free, off-leash WILL increase the number of aggressive dogs who are unstable. These animals will be more likely to bite children and other dogs, among other issues.
Organization:
Commenter: Julie N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5560 **Comment Id:** 363944 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Please please NO NOT LET THIS MEASURE GO THROUGH. I feel it will negatively effect the lives of so many. I am a responsible dog owner who cleans up after my dogs, is respectful of others, and derives great joy and health from romping on the beach with my mutts. Please do not stifle this crucial source of health and enjoyment for myself and thousands of others.
Organization:
Commenter: john p whitty **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5605 **Comment Id:** 363996 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to

express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Kali Kraum **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5631 **Comment Id:** 364038 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: MCL also agrees with Alternative F's general approach to trails in the Marin Headlands, which is to allow on-leash dog access on the perimeter of the area, while protecting the integrity of wild inner portions frequented by coyote, bobcat, and other wildlife with large territories and need of protections. This approach safety also enhances visitor safety.

Organization: Marin Conservation League

Commenter: Jon Elam **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5634 **Comment Id:** 364052 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The site should continue as it is. as a dog park to take our dogs to walk,play and socialize, on or off leash, throughout the park without proposed limitations. Today, it is rare that I see folks behaving badly, and I believe that the use of the park as is, and if it were able to continue as is, would actually be an asset to the site at Fort Funston, as well as the other sites. If it were to be changed as proposed, I believe there would be less visitors to the site, since most of the visitors are dog owners/walkers, and crime would likely return and become the problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth F Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5659 **Comment Id:** 364088 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog owners who live in the densely populated city will have nowhere to go. There are very few open areas. When these become too crowded, dogs get nervous and accidents occur.

Organization:

Commenter: elizabeth cavagnaro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5698 **Comment Id:** 364162 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover,

this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Carly M Braak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5698 **Comment Id:** 364164 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe we'd see a huge increase in reported incidents if all the dogs in this city don't have a place to workout off-leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Carly M Braak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5728 **Comment Id:** 364192 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreational activity with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years

Organization:

Commenter: Kelly M Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5741 **Comment Id:** 364220 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there were only a few actual incidents including: only 6 dog bites report, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. There were 2 additional incidents reported where "people were scared." Taken in context of the hundreds of thousands of dog visits to the GGNRA, this data does not support the requested need for a change. Further, the data most certainaly does not justify the funding request for $2M to fund more park rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Hugh McDermott **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5752 **Comment Id:** 364237 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I ask that you consider the data released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. I don't feel that data supports the requested needs for a change.

Organization:

Commenter: Diego E Castaneda **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5785 **Comment Id:** 364299 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Nothing better than allowing you and your dog to run free in these selected areas of San Francisco. I so enjoy meeting and talking to other dog owners. We are happy there which creates a happy vibe which means we treat the areas well! Please don't do this to us ~ we need the wide open spaces for our health and our doggies health!!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5797 **Comment Id:** 364318 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When you look at the GGNRA's own statistics and consider the hundreds of thousands of dog visits annually at Fort Funston, the number of problem dog incidents is astoundingly low. This should be a case of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" instead of throwing $2 million at a bogus problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Sheila Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364479 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The most recent data (2012-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been very few negative incidents involving dogs as compared to the many more reported negative incidents involving people. This data therefore does not support the request or the need for a change as proposed in the draft dog management plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5892 **Comment Id:** 364481 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I used to also frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command, less now, because they are too crowded, my dog feels more tense, there's not enough room to exercise, and they cause more stress to both me and my dog, rather than relaxation.

Organization:

Commenter: Sanj Madan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5893 **Comment Id:** 364487 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for $2,000,000 for more rangers.

Organization:

Commenter: Anne Schnobrich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5889 **Comment Id:** 364521 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In terms of the incidents that sometimes occur, the sparse documentation provided vis-ï¿½-vis the incidents reports in the document imply less than one dog-related incident per 20,000 to 30,000 visits. Not bad. People dont behave that well in shopping malls. As to the environmental issues, the case for any serious consequences has not been made.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5922 **Comment Id:** 364642 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Taking Ft. Funston away from us as dog owners would mean squeezing hundreds more dogs into city parks which has already shown to create stress for the dogs and owners resulting in more fights between dogs AND owners because of confined space and lack of room to run and be free.

Organization:

Commenter: Steve J Baechtle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5957 **Comment Id:** 364786 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I wish to formally and firmly oppose the new GGNRA draft dog management plan. I am a frequent user of local park areas with my dog, who is always well behaved, and who I always clean up after. These outdoor recreational areas are what makes life in the city possible for my family and my dog, and it would be severely restrict our ability to happily and healthily live in this city we call home.

Organization:

Commenter: William Geddes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5975 **Comment Id:** 364845 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Without a place for my dog to run around safely, our quality of lives (and our neighbors) will plummet to an unacceptable level. Inadequate levels of exercise lead to

behavioral problems, which will ultimately disturb the peace for many San Francisco residents (barking, property destruction, etc.).

Organization:

Commenter: Laura A Kelso **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5979 **Comment Id:** 364847 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Even more wonderful for the dog and the dog owner is watching dogs play off leash. Dogs need to be socialized as they are pack animals and want to be with each other. Playing together gives them exercise, enjoyment and lets off tension and stress, just like it does for humans. Fort Funston is a treasure for dogs to romp and play and has been for decades now. I have taken my dogs and friends dogs to this place and never have I seen problems with playing and getting along

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Cappa **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4418 **Comment Id:** 365164 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: This plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily excludes the Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their canine companions. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.

Organization:

Commenter: Carol Schlesinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6068 **Comment Id:** 365296 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For this reason, I am writing to express my significant opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It restricts the area to off leash dog walking way too strictly and will have detrimental effects on both my health and that of my dog.

Organization:

Commenter: Kiley M Nichols **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6079 **Comment Id:** 365367 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Claims by Mr. Dean himself that dog-related incidents are the largest percentage of complaints received by the GGNRA are not supported by either the data provided in the DEIS or SEIS, or by the the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA. Out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs last year alone, there have only been 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife

killing, and 1 horse bite incident documented. However, the reported incidents involving people are much higher.

Organization:

Commenter: C Beckman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6082 **Comment Id:** 365378 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: This plan isn't reasonable. Our dogs need space to run. This plan will only cause angry conflicts in parks where people should be doing healthy things. The people working in these areas will take the brunt of the publics' anger if this enforced. Everybody loses under this plan.

Organization: Dog owner

Commenter: Larry J Yant **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6101 **Comment Id:** 365418 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Fort Funston is arguably the most popular place for dog walking and the plan to eliminate the vast majority of space for off-leash access and condense dogs into small areas is dangerous. There is no rationale and it could set up confrontations between dogs as well as people in small places. Furthermore, there is no justification for cutting off beach access between Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. Why would you want to do that? The plan cites two protected species at Fort Funston, the state threatened Bank Swallow (State) and the federally and state threatened San Francisco lessingia. However, there is no evidence that dogs or humans for that matter affect the swallow and the lessingia does not exist at Funston.

Organization:

Commenter: Dave Emanuel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6111 **Comment Id:** 365426 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I urge you to reconsider this ill-conceived plan. We are counting on you to be able to exercise both ourselves and our dog responsibly.

Organization:

Commenter: Julie S Ryan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6116 **Comment Id:** 365465 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Undocumented Assumptions - The DEIS is full of assumptions about impacts - things that might or could happen - but there is no evidence of actual observed impacts. Cannot base management plan on hypotheticals. The GGNRA has had years to observe and document actual observed impacts. The fact the GGNRA did not include them in the DEIS indicates they dont exist. Safety - DEIS claims a major safety problem with dogs in the GGNRA. But their own

data indicates dogs accounted for only 2% o serious safety incidents involved dogs. The vast majority of serious incidents involved people only. Even if you include non-serious incidents, dogs accounted for a mere 7% o incidents in the GGNRA. Dogs are not a major safety problem.

Organization:

Commenter: SUSAN OBAYASHI **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6123 **Comment Id:** 365493 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Celene Matthews **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6124 **Comment Id:** 365500 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: There is an inherent conflict between "minimizing conflicts" and "including areas where dogs are allowed", and the report says nothing about how these conflicting goals are weighted or balanced. At present, the number of conflicts is exceedingly low (only 95 reports in 4 years, compared against 4.5 million incidents nationwide), and the present arrangement provides for a tremendous quantity of high-value experiences, as any visitor to the GGNRA can plainly see. The proposed plans will dramatically curtail experiences related to dog walking while providing no obvious reduction in the number of dog-attacks. Therefore, I do not believe that this objective is met by any of the new proposals, and is in fact, worsened by each of them.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6316 **Comment Id:** 365505 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I will not be able to get the exercise I need either if the leash law is enforced. I depend on that precious hour in the park every morning to get my exercise with my dogs. I don't have any other time to work out, and if I have to choose, then I will be walking my dogs on-leash in the street rather than spending that hour in a gym without them.

Organization:

Commenter: Laura Hansen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6131 **Comment Id:** 365526 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I recognize the difficulty in trying to please so many diverse user groups. However, as a dog owner, I do not support the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.

It will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Karen Raimondo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6142 **Comment Id:** 365608 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS data still do not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. Between 2008 to 2011 it reports 95 dog bites. That's a minuscule number considering the tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of dog walks that must have taken place within the GGNRA during those four years.

Organization:

Commenter: Robert A Dewey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6155 **Comment Id:** 365650 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Per the latest data released by the GGNRA, the claim that dog-related incidents are the largest percentage of complaints received is false. Out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs last year alone, there have only been 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident documented (2012-2013 report). However, the incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the reported necessity for any change in policy for improved public safety or visitor experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim M **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6178 **Comment Id:** 365757 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I carefully read the section of the report from pages 252-258, which describes many of the reported dog-related incidents. Over a 10-year period, there are reports of about 4000 events, which averages to 400/year or about 30 each month - roughly one each day. This sounds terrible, but there is no data offered for comparison. What is the incidence of dog-related incidents in a comparably-sized park with comparable volume of visitors, and dogs either not allowed or only allowed on leash? Is it much lower, the same, or much higher? Without any comparative analysis, this data is absolutely meaningless, and is not useful as a basis for a massive change in policy. If the NPS wants to impose a policy change on the GGNRA, and wants to offer data to support this change, the NPS should offer enough data to show that the policy change will have the intended effect. This data does not indicate anything useful about the proposed policy change.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6358 **Comment Id:** 365798 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: It is critical that Fort Funston continue to allow off-leash dog walking on the paved pathways. In addition to the benefits to visitors, including the elderly and disabled, there is a real risk associated with requiring leashes in the constricted pathways, with tangled leashes around people's feet and ankles, risking falls and rope burns. These are neither trivial nor merely theoretical concerns; as a physician I have seen both kinds of injuries from dog leashes more than once, as well as other orthopedic injuries associated with the use of leashes. It appears to actually be safer in many respects for dogs to be off-leash when circumstances allow. The very fact that the current de facto off-leash dog walking protocol at Draft Dog Management Plan has continued without noticeable incident during our very frequent visits indicates that this situation does not need to be restricted.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6390 **Comment Id:** 365826 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Secondly, at Fort Funston, you have chosen to require leashes on the sand ladder and on the path from beach to trail on the north end of the beach. Have you ever walked with a dog on a leash up or down either or those? THIS WILL SET THIS UP FOR FAILURE AS THE ELDERLY OR ANYONE WHO HAS A DOG OVER 20 LBS WHO PULLS ON THE LEASH (AS ALL DOGS CAN DO) COULD DESTABILIZE THE PERSON AND CAUSE INJURY.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6200 **Comment Id:** 366000 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: For the years from 2008 to 2011, in most cases, there has been a steady and significant downward trend in the number of these incidents. For example, at Crissy Field, the number of incidents falls from almost 200 to much less than 100, including a dramatic reduction in the incidents of dogs in the WPA. These reductions have come about because of increased efforts at education, as well as self-policing of these areas. On the basis of this data, I believe the present policy is working, and that some additional investment in education would produce significant benefits. In contrast, the report gives no evidence to show that the proposed policy changes will have beneficial effects, or that the presence of the proposed policies in other comparable urban park settings has had these benefits.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6209 **Comment Id:** 366122 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a frequent visitor and future resident of Montara, I oppose the proposed 'Regulated Off Leash Area' (ROLA) in the area between Le Conte St. and Tamarind St., Montara in the Rancho Corral de Tierra area of the GGNRA. Reference Alternative 'C' and 'E' of the GGNRA draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)." Some reasons to oppose the 'dog park' in this area: - Preserve / conserve the open space - The operation of the adjacent school and student safety will be adversely impacted - The streets accessing the area are not suited to additional traffic - The existing quiet neighborhood will be degraded by noise and traffic A fenced off-leash area directly adjacent to a residential community will be unsightly - dog excrement will accumulate despite best efforts by owners to cleanup. This is not only unsightly, but a potential public health hazard where dog parasites can contaminate the soil. Urine and fecal matter accumulation will smell and will ruin grass and topsoil. Barking and yelping will contribute to noise pollution.

Organization:

Commenter: Ellis Tobin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6221 **Comment Id:** 366142 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Ours and all dogs need plenty of space to run off leash. Countless reasons that are stated to support maintaining the off leash trails and beaches. To maintain good health dogs need to run hard and the most effective way to run is off leash. Please consider the behavior that may result when our well exercised dogs are denied their rift to run free.....possible bad behavior which may include aggressiveness.

Organization:

Commenter: Louise Selin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6222 **Comment Id:** 366145 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I believe dogs should be able to roam in parks to remain strong and healthy. If dogs don't get the energy that their bodies require, it can lead to behavior issues. In conclusion, if parks and trails no longer let dogs roam and get the exercise that their bodies need, it can result in aggressive behavior, unhealthiness, and most importantly unhappiness. If dogs can roam free, these things have a better chance of not occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Laila C LoRe **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6240 **Comment Id:** 366163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If we are limited to one small area, I will be forced to simply watch my dog play, instead of getting exercise with her. I have many, many friends and neighbors who feel the same way. Unfortunately, living in a densely populated city, this is the only way for me and my dog to get great exercise and enjoy time together.

Organization:

Commenter: Nicole D H **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6246 **Comment Id:** 366189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I begin with the public health impact. Every owner knows "a tired dog is a happy dog," and many people like me are urban residents who rely on these GGNRA areas to give ourselves and our dogs the daily exercise they require for our physical and mental health and socialization. Your Plan would impose an undue burden on SF dog owners for whom daily commuting to some remote rural location to allow their dogs to run freely while under voice control would be prohibitive. Dog ownership helps promote the public health and well-being, and the GGNRA serves as an important resource for Bay Area residents with and without dogs in this context, especially in the current areas where off leash walking is permitted.
Organization:
Commenter: Rhonda Vitanye **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366221 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The report continually treats as fact the idea that dog waste contaminates soil and water and poses a threat to human health but provides no data to support this. It would not require a tremendous amount of resources to test samples for microbes commonly found in dog waste, but I suspect the GGNRA fears the results would not support their conclusions.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6404 **Comment Id:** 366226 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The SEIS also emphasizes the incidence of hazardous interactions between dogs and people in the GGNRA. No one would suggest that these incidences are not serious, but the report implies they are the norm rather than an extremely rare event. Although this information is not presented side-by-side in the report, by gathering data from separate sections of the SEIS, I estimate that there were ~140 hazardous dog citations over four years (2008-2011) in all GGNRA lands out of ~2000 total dog incidences in the same period, or less than 10%. were 95 documented dog bites in all of the GGNRA during those four years or approximately 24 per year. The GGNRA estimates 15 million visitors every year and estimating that ~20% o those visitors are accompanied by a dog (3 million), that puts the rate of dog bites at 0.000008%. put into this context, the threat from dangerous or aggressive dogs is vanishingly small and does not justify the disproportionate focus of the SEIS.
Organization:
Commenter: Sarah R Green **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6405 **Comment Id:** 366261 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The proposed change in limiting off leash areas which dog owners have come enjoy for years is dramatic and harsh to dog owners. This will force more dog owners into smaller more concentrated areas which creates an unhealthy environment for all concerned.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6408 **Comment Id:** 366946 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Alternative F does not adequately address safety concerns for visitors and dogs on the Fort Point Promenade, which is between the edge of a heavily used roadway and the edge of the seawall, and on trails in the Fort Point area that are heavily used by visitors and can be congested. Even with the current requirement that dogs be kept on leash, during my visits to the area, I noticed a number of dogs off-leash. Please adopt Alternative D in order to better reduce the potential for conflicts among users and the possibility of interactions with aggressive dogs and compromised visitor and dog safety.

Organization:

Commenter: Christopher Lish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6420 **Comment Id:** 366981 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: At Fort Mason, the area has long been used for dog walking, both on leash and off. It is a convenient location for many SF residents who need to walk and recreate with their dogs before and after work. In order to separate the dog walkers, you have set aside the green space on the corner of Bay Street across from Safeway for off-leash walking. This land slopes directly into the street! If dogs are allowed to play here off-leash there will surely be balls and dogs going into the busy street, which would be disaster. I imagine the only way to rectify this would be to build a very tall, expensive and unwanted fence. This will block views and destroy the open space San Francisco have enjoyed for a very long time.

Organization:

Commenter: Leslie Dicke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6609 **Comment Id:** 367174 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm highly concerned about the proposed leash-only areas and am wondering what the ramifications will be? How many altercations will ensue? How crowded will the off-leash parks around me become? Whan about parking? How will my dog get her exercise? How will I get my exercise? The questions are endless. The reasons to pass the plan are few and unproven.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Schulting **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6612 **Comment Id:** 367189 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Restricting off 'leash areas will increase pressure on dogs which I believe it will be detrimental to safety similar to the impact that dog parks have when there are too many dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Alice Sakamoto **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6623 **Comment Id:** 367480 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: By severely restricting dogs to ever smaller areas, it becomes a self fulfilling prophecy that there will be problems. You put more pressure on the dogs to interact in smaller spaces. People who love their dogs will drive as far as they need to for off leash areas. By limiting people in Marin and San Francisco you force them to converge on areas where off leash use is allowed. More dogs in smaller spaces will lead to more conflict.
Organization:
Commenter: Lisa Eshman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6435 **Comment Id:** 367489 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: What I can predict from the legislation and reduced areas of off leash access is many folded. Smaller dog areas and more ON-leash requirements will escalate the number of dog fights especially in a group setting. The familiar "flight or fight" response: Dogs who will feel threatened or scared and can not create space to make them selves safe will have to fight because they have no choice. Which will inevitably result in more dog on dog and dog on human altercations which will only reinforce the nay-sayers who were against dogs all along.
Organization:
Commenter: Natalie Tondelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6630 **Comment Id:** 367508 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I take my dog, who is well behaved, to Crissy Field, Fort Funston Ocean Beach to run. If he had to be leased neither of us would get people exercise.
Organization:
Commenter: Francine Fillice **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6472 **Comment Id:** 367525 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: With the current state of no enforcement at the parks, it is obvious that individuals will do as they please unless someone with a badge is immediately ready to ticket them. If you plan to enforce the new regulations, you will only be cramming the same number of off leash users into a smaller area, which will only increase the number of public safety issues as

off leash dogs need plenty of space from each other to ease social tension.
Organization: The Domestic Animal
Commenter: Shannon Bolt **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367528 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: These proposed restrictions (only 7 of the 22 areas proposed would allow dog walking access on GGNRA lands in all three counties), in turn, will likely increase user conflict because of the limited remaining space for dog recreation. For example, the proposal to have dogs on leashes at places like Baker Beach or Muir Beach will simply not work and is unrealitisic. And there is no factual or scientific basis in closing off leash dog walking at East Beach or the Grassy Airfield at Crissy Field nor at any of the areas under consideration. What dog can you take to the beach and not have them romp and have fun? Dogs and people need socialization for a healthy and happy lifestyle.
Organization:
Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5822 **Comment Id:** 367536 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: A fact to consider: in the year 2012 to 2013, (data I received from a GGNRA staffer) out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs; there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. While I am troubled that these dog-related incidents occurred and want to prevent any type of further dog incidents, I believe that expanding the San Francisco SPCAs Off Leash Open Space dog-training class would help to reduce such dog related incidents in the future. Also, it is my understanding the human incidents rate in the GGNRA for the same time period is much, much higher. This data does not support a need for change to further restrict off leash dog walking.
Organization:
Commenter: martha r walters **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6637 **Comment Id:** 367562 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I'm now 80 years old, still active, and walking my dogs off leash, as I have for the past 40 or so years. My health and mental well being are in your hands.
Organization:
Commenter: Mort S Gensberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6510 **Comment Id:** 367624 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: . It seems to be the assumption in the SEIS that conflict disappears with the

proposed plan; that under the current rule there is conflict, but when you drastically reduce the area we're permitted in, conflict disappears. This makes no sense

Organization: Fort Funston Dog Walkers

Commenter: Linda F McKay **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6518 **Comment Id:** 367652 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Social and Economic Impacts: The SEIS did not address the social and health benefits of dog walking. Cities are advertising how dog friendly they are, Mendocino and Carmel for example. How will these restrictions effect tourism? People with their dogs who come from other parts of the Bay Area may not come as often and will not be spending money at local restaurants and shops.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy Stafford **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367984 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The severe truncation of space and opportunity reflected in the GGNRA "preferred alternative" sends the wrong message regarding exercise, and regarding off-leash recreation. The GGNRA is failing to capitalize on the opportunity to recognize and support the value of walking ones dog as a means of maintaining fitness and improving health in an incremental, continuous and positive manner. With its present Pet Policy, the GGNRA is on the cutting edge of demonstrating and providing a venue for lifelong recreation and a multi-generational healthy life style. The GGNRA should be a model for healthy exercise in an urban setting, positive treatment of pets, and the creation of community in an urban context. This is a model to be celebrated and replicated, not destroyed.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 367989 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: However, the planned reduction of space which will corral the dogs and their owners into a tenth of the one percent of land now available, and the requirement to walk dogs only on-leash on trails will create a dangerous situation for both owners and dogs. (4) In a recreational use survey of Fort Funston carried out in 2000, it was noted that Fort Funston alone accommodates more than five percent of GGNRA visitors, but comprises less than 0.3 percent of GGNRA acreage. (5) The reduction of space and access proposed by the Dog Management Plan is unnecessary and untenable, will lay the foundation for negative behavior and territoriality, and will destroy what is now a viable, valuable, and beloved national recreational resource.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6629 **Comment Id:** 368001 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The one place where the SEIS found some hard data was in relation to "dog incidents" in the GGNRA. In the four years from 2008 to 2011, with the hundreds of thousands of people and dog visits to the GGNRA, most of the dog incidents reported had to do with leash law violations. In this entire period, there were only 95 cases of dog bites or attacks. (17) In contrast to this, over that same period, 89% of the reported safety incidents had nothing to do with dogs, and they included murder, larceny, rape, robbery and drugs. The GGNRA should begin to realize that their safest areas are those where the dogs are, as is the case also in city areas where people walk with their dogs. It would be nice to know the number of people and dogs who walk in the GGNRA, but as the GGNRA is not monitored, this data is unavailable.

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Pittin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6649 **Comment Id:** 368226 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRAs new draft management plan. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dogs health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne and Russell Hawley and Rosenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6656 **Comment Id:** 368250 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In the information from the GGNRA, the only data I was able to find showed that in the last year with hundreds of thousands of visits by people and dogs, only 6 dog bites were reported. The data also specified 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite. These exceedingly low numbers hardly call for a drastic change in the 1979 Pet Policy.

Organization:

Commenter: Joan M Kaplan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6681 **Comment Id:** 368266 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The EIS/SEIS both failed to establish the number of visitors to Fort Funston. As a result of the failure to establish the number of visitors per year to Fort Funston, the reports of problems with dogs (or people) cannot be evaluated. Per the SEIS, the GGNRA has between 13 million and 15 million visitors per year, yet the overall "dog related" incidents for the years 2008 through 2011 were only 2,775. 2,775 incidents versus a minimum of 52 million visitors (13 million multiplied by 4 years) is statistically insignificant. While I am sure the NPS knows the approximate number of yearly visitors to Fort Funston, it has conveniently chosen not to include

this very important information in the SEIS which prevents an accurate discussion of the impact of dog walking at Fort Funston. The 172 "dog related" incidents between 2008-2011 at Fort Funston have not been evaluated in relationship to the number of visitors to Fort Funston between 2008-2011. Therefore, the conclusion on page 221 that there are a high number of dog related incidents and conflicts affecting Human Safety has not been established.

Organization:

Commenter: Joanne Mahoney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368406 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I examined 29 incidents from the 2009 and 2010 incidents reports involving visitors being attacked by dogs. In 16 of 29 (55%) dents reviewed, the owner of the attacking dog either absconded from the victim or law enforcement or provided contact information that was bogus. This result suggest that a high proportion of visitors walking off-leash dogs are scofflaws in terms of taking responsibility for the actions of their dogs and having consideration for the other visitors affected. Visitors must realize that if attacked by a dog, it is likely that the perpetrating owner will not be identified. Visitors may have to undergo rabies shots and may not have any possibility of recovering costs associated with a serious injury. Such scofflaw behavior needs to be taken into account by GGNRA in formulating dog management regulations. It suggests that GGNRA should require that all dogs wear collars with proof of vaccination and that off-leash activity should be strictly compartmentalized withifl the Park, so that visitors wishing to minimize the risk can go elsewhere.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368426 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The SEIS presents data on dog-related incidents but does not provide a discussion of the limitations of the data and the context needed to understand and interpret data. The raw data is presented in a way that might lead one to draw conclusions about the total number of dog-related violations per year in GGNRA or to compare the number of dog walking violations and hazards between specific areas of the Park. Without information on the effort on the part of law enforcement involved in patrolling each area and the normal behavior of off-leash dog walkers, the data is just a random collection of numbers that show nothing beyond the existence of certain types of violations by dog owners in the Park. In fact, the data represents such a small sliver of the actual violations occurring that without further data it is impossible to even estimate the number and type of violations actually occurring.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 4256 **Comment Id:** 368469 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The Preferred Alternative fails to specify how visitor safety and resource protection will be achieved in the vicinity of the ROLA's. The Preferred Alternative does not describe how park visitors will be adequately informed of the ROLA boundaries, nor does it clearly ensure that off-leash dogs will be contained within the ROLA's. These shortcomings are potentials for excessive conflict.

Organization:

Commenter: Matthew & JoAnn Zlatunich **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6565 **Comment Id:** 368697 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: The draft plan/SEIS also overlooks the commonsense fact that by severely limiting the off-leash space in the GGNRA, dog owners and their pets will be squeezed into much smaller municipal park areas of local communities, which will increase potential conflicts and negative impacts. This is also true of forcing people with dogs into much smaller areas within the GGNRA itself.

Organization:

Commenter: Shannon Yodowitz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 804 **Comment Id:** 368717 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Although I agree with what is written, a reasonable review of the medical literature supports a much stronger view of the health benefits of dog ownership. I believe I have standing to offer additional information; to wit, The American Heart Association, in its peer reviewed medical journal Circulation recently (May 9, 2013) published an analysis of this issue (http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/early/2013/05/09/CIR.0b013e31829201e1.full.pdf html) entitled Pet Ownership and Cardiovascular Risk: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. They noted on page 1 that cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death in the United States. Further, obesity and physical inactivity are at epidemic proportions. They concluded on page 4 that Pet ownership, particularly dog ownership, is probably associated with decreased CVD risk (Level of Evidence: B). Level of evidence refers to the estimate of certainty or precision of the treatment effect. In order to reach a higher level of evidence, more studies would be needed and randomized studies would be required: this is problematic as it is hard to get patients to agree to being randomized into a study where they either get or do not get a dog, and further, it would be difficult to perform a blinded study as most participants would know whether or not there is a dog in their house! The American Heart Association further concluded, Pet ownership, particularly dog ownership, may have some causal role in reducing CVD risk (Level of Evidence: B). It is my professional medical opinion, as supported by the best available applicable medical literature, that dog ownership is causally related to lowering the risk of the most deadly disease in the United States of America today. Restricting available parkland that can be used for dog can reasonably be inferred to be likely to decrease exercise and pet ownership, and would likely cost lives. I humbly submit that page 35 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement should be strengthened to reflect the medical evidence that this is a matter of life and death for some visitors, and any analysis of limiting areas where dogs are to be allowed should include loss of human life as the

likely outcome of any significant restrictions. As noted on page 1226, under the heading HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY GUIDING POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

Organization:

Commenter: Dean G Kardassakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 804 **Comment Id:** 368718 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Pages 1231-2 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement concerns pathogens. It notes, Evidence shows that pets and urban wildlife can be significant bacterial sources. In the case of Fort Funston, the facts clearly show otherwise. The San Francisco Public Utillities Comission operates the Oceanside Wastewater Treatment Facility and Lake Merced. It monitors Ocean Beach and Lake Merced for bacterial contamination. The Daly City Water and Wastewater Facility monitors water quality just to the South of Fort Funston. I separately asked both of these government agencies if they had any evidence of even a single case of water contamination of any kind that has been attributed to dogs at Fort Funston since the GGNRA was established on October 27, 2013. By personal communication, both agencies could not find any evidence of dogs as a detectable source of bacterial contamination. A related issue that has been noted is that horse owners would like to be able to ride in areas apart from dogs. As a dog owner, I can from personal experience attest that dog owners frequently pick-up their pets waste material. Sadly, my experience is that horse owners do not do the same. Thus, any consideration of limiting dog access, in favor of the pleasure of equestrians, should consider the potential for worsening of this problem. The Statement also notes, Assuming compliance with the regulation, the amount of dog waste at each site should decline and would reduce the health and safety risks associated with dog-related pathogens. I challenge this assertion. It assumes by limiting dog access, the net amount of fecal material would be decreased, and unless there was a concomitant prohibition of riding, this assertion could be described as horse manure. In any case, bacterial contamination has been monitored and not found to be an issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Dean G Kardassakis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1137 **Comment Id:** 368734 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Finally, if GGNRA significantly reduces the amount of space dogs have to run undoubtedly there will be more dog-dog problems as the dogs are squished into spaces that are far too small to accommodate the number of dogs using said space.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth B Gaynor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2794 **Comment Id:** 368782 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs and Pathogens 1. SEIS says: Dogs expose visitors to dangerous

pathogens. The SEIS first makes this claim on page 336, where no data or scientific studies are cited to support the claim. There is a long list of possibly, can expose, and many mays. Then a long quote from an anti-dog DEIS commenter discusses dogs run[ning] up and pee[ing] on innocent bystanders. Later, on page 1231-1232, SEIS says, Currently, adverse impacts on visitor human health and safety from dog-related pathogens exist at all park sites considered in this draft plan/SEIS. Sites such as Fort Funston&may have more of a health and safety risk from dog-related pathogens... Again, absolutely no evidence is offered of any adverse impacts on human health from dog-related pathogens at Fort Funston, or anywhere else in the GGNRA. Instead, we get the opinion of another anti-dog commenter on the DEIS: One commenter noted that multiple infections have been reported at local hospitals from bacteria transmitted from dog feces. The commenter then provides a long list of diseases he claims were transmitted by dogs. No citation is offered to any document; there is no way check the veracity of the statement. Thats not evidence of anything. So in both cases of the claim, GGNRA offers no evidence, only the un-scientific opinions of two un-identified, strongly biased, anti-dog commenters which GGNRA selects from the thousands of DEIS comments. I suppose we should be thankful that GGNRA has dropped its doubly bogus citation of a non-existent document that it used in the Draft EIS to make this unsupportable claim. Remember NPS 1999, the substudy of the San Francisco Sewage Master Plan? In fact NPS 1999 was something unrelated, and no such substudy of a sewage master plan existed. Now, without any pretense of evidence, GGNRA continues to make the claim, and relies on two biased anti-dog commenters as substitute for real evidence.

Organization:

Commenter: Keith McAllister **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4287 **Comment Id:** 368814 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: On leash exercise limits the dog to my level of fitness, and that means that by forcing on leash requirements you are binding the exercise of many dogs to that of handicapped, and elderly owners. My dog forces me to go out every day and take a walk, and although that can be in my local neighborhood it is nothing like our walks in the Marin Headlands, or Lands End paths, or along Crissy Field.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Norton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4304 **Comment Id:** 368820 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs make our communities livable for many of us and need extensive space to run. As someone with health challenges myself, my dog walking enables me to maintain my health (a value not only for me but for my community)We need more off-leash space, not less and we need dog owners as an important voice for the value of parks and open space- not an antagonized rejected group. Please! Please! Do not allow that to happen.

Organization:

Commenter: Larry Cohen **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6536 **Comment Id:** 368842 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: The policy changes will not reduce the number of dog attack incidents in the GGNRA.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6576 **Comment Id:** 368856 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe.
Organization:
Commenter: Kellyn Umanzor **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6568 **Comment Id:** 369562 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As I have gotten older it has become more important for me to have outdoor recreational access for myself and my dogs near my home. I need to keep myself and my dogs fit in order to pursue dog agility and hiking with dogs, which activities help keep me physically healthy, mentally stimulated, and in good emotional health. And the local dog walks also keep me part of an important community of other active people with dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: Linda Wilford **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6581 **Comment Id:** 369572 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Airfield at Crissy Field Your preferred alternative as regards the airfield is counter productive. The area is very large and can absorb a huge number of people with dogs without interferring with walkers and joggers on the path or people walking on the beach. By restricting the use to a small middle section, you miss an opportunity to keep dogs away from the people and resources you want to protect. In addition, there is no easy access to parking if people with dogs want to access this section of the field. I fear that people will park alongside the low buildings opposite the field and will not be able to safely unload their dogs and will have to dart across a section of Mason Street where cars drive too fast and there is no crosswalk to protect pedestrians. This is dangerous! In addition, both areas are now permitted paid parking which is expensive and prohibitive for many who want to use the park. The rest of the airfield is rarely in use by anyone but people with dogs and should be open to use. There is no sensible reason for it to be restricted. Many people park in the lot behind Sports Basement which allows free and safe unloading of dogs and well as safe crossing of Mason Street for access to the field. It makes sense to limit the section of the airfield west of the sidewalk opposite Stillwell Hall as many families using the facilities in the hangars play and picnic in this area.
Organization:

Commenter: Sally Cancelmo **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6591 **Comment Id:** 369585 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Studies have shown that dog ownership increases recreational walking - supporting both recreational use of the area along with improved health benefits for the population. Another study showed that 40% of those walking/hiking in at an urban site were dog walking. Use of GGNRA lands by dog walkers is clearly a primary recreational activity.
Organization:
Commenter: Julie Speigler **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6672 **Comment Id:** 369595 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I support the GGNRA's plan to ban off-lease dog walking on most of the federal lands. Many dog owners keep their dogs on-lease, however, as a senior and a walker it has been my experience that unrestrained, enthusiastic dogs are a danger to me and greatly lessen the enjoyment of walking.
Organization:
Commenter: Gail Lindlow **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369659 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: In testimony before the San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare Commission on February 8, 2007, Jean Donaldson, the founder and then-director of the SF/SPCA Dog Training Academy said: Off-leash play has not proven to be a factor in dog bites. According to both the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American Veterinarian Medical Association, the majority of bites take place on the guardians property. The remaining incidents involve dogs that are either restrained, i.e., leashed, or dogs that are at large, [that is,] unsupervised dogs that have escaped confinement. Consider for example, the three highest profile serious dog attacks in the history of San Francisco. Those are Diane Whipple in 2001, Sean Jones in 2001, and Nicholas Faibish in 2005. In the first, the dogs were on-leash. In the second, the dogs had escaped confinement in the backyard and were at large. And in the third, the dog was confined in the guardians home. I would add that in all these instances, the dogs were un-neutered. Interestingly, it could very well be that the safest dogs are those that attend off-leash dog parks. Shyan and cohorts published a research paper in 2003 in the Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science which looked at the prevalence of interdog aggression in dog parks. Dog-dog problems turned out to be minimal and of a non-serious nature. While the paper did not consider the question of dog-to-human aggression, the obvious interpretation of this low incidence of aggression was interesting and I think very relevant. They suggested that self-selection operates strongly, i.e., people who take the time to get into their car or walk to a designated off-leash area to exercise their dog tend to not be the type who are derelict in other areas of dog guardianship, such as training, socialization or appropriate containment. Note: The study she referred to is: Bark Parks - A Study on Interdog Aggression in a Limited-Control

Environment, by Melissa R. Shyan, Kristina A. Fortune, and Christine King, Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science, vol. 6, no. 1, 2003 Again, I gave the GGNRA this information as part of a DEIS comment (submitted as Chair of the Animal Control and Welfare Commission), yet it was ignored. Instead the SETS chose to present information on dog bites in a sensational manner designed to convince readers of the need for restricting off-leash access to prevent dog bites.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369661 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: On pp. 253 and 254, the SETS says: In addition to obtaining the annual law enforcement incident databases from 2001 through 2011, paper copies of the dog-related law enforcement incident reports for the years 2008 through 2011 were obtained from GGNRA to conduct a more detailed analysis for each GGNRA site. ... The number of dog-related incidents in the 2008 through 2011 analysis does not match the number of incidents in the analysis of the overall law enforcement data in table 5 (which includes incidents not related to dogs) because incident reports may contain more than one violation. ... there were often multiple incident violations per incident report. This was not done for the overall law enforcement data analysis because incident reports not related to dogs did not generally include multiple violations and there was insufficient staff time available to review the approximately 40,000 incident reports not related to dogs. Essentially, the SETS assumes that non-dog-related incident reports will not contain multiple violations as the dog-related ones do. They dont know for sure, because the paragraph makes clear that they did not actually study the paper reports for non-dog related incidents. If the total number of non-dog violations is higher because of multiple violations per incident, then the percentage of dog-related incidents, compared to the total number of incidents might be even smaller than the 11% figure reported above. That the SETS did not perform this analysis of paper copies of reports for both the dog-related and non-dog-related incidents, and instead did it for just one of them, is just sloppy science. The point to keep in mind is that 89% of the incident reports in the GGNRA had nothing to do with dogs, including violent people-on-people crime. It is people who are the safety threat, not dogs. The SEIS analysis of impacts on Human Health and Safety at each site focuses on negative impacts (bites, diseases, aggression) while seeming to ignore positive benefits to human health and social community from dog walking. Thus Alternative A for Fort Funston is determined to have long-term moderate to major adverse impacts on Human Health and Safety (p. 1312) while Alternative F is determined to have long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts (p. 1318). Similar analyses are given for Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. This is a biased analysis of impacts.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6588 **Comment Id:** 369662 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The SEIS analysis of impacts on Human Health and Safety at each site focuses on negative impacts (bites, diseases, aggression) while seeming to ignore positive benefits to human health and social community from dog walking. Thus Alternative A for Fort Funston is

determined to have long-term moderate to major adverse impacts on Human Health and Safety (p. 1312) while Alternative F is determined to have long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts (p. 1318). Similar analyses are given for Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. This is a biased analysis of impacts. On p. 338, the SETS reports that a survey of guide dog handlers found that: ... a total of 83 percent of respondents had experienced interface by an aggressive dog. The majority of the attacks or interface occurred on a public-right-of-way including sidewalk and roadways. Results showed that 76 percent of dog attacks were from an off-leash dog... An off-leash dog on a sidewalk or roadway is likely to be a dog guarding its home and property or a dog that has gotten out with no owner around to control it. These circumstances are not found in the GGNRA. The more appropriate statistic would be to report the number of incidents that happened in parks like the GGNRA. The SETS contains no information on this. Therefore, this study is not particularly useful for determining risks to guide dogs in the GGNRA. Because the SEIS presents information on dog bites in a more inflammatory manner than is warranted by the facts, and its own data show that dog-related incidents are a small fraction of the incidents reported in the GGNRA, and most of those are leash law violations with no disturbance of wildlife or resource degradation, the SETS does not prove that dogs are a major problem in the GGNRA. Because it does not prove that. the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

Organization: San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Commenter: Sally Stephens **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

GGNRA Dog Management Plan
Substantive Issues Report

(05/29/2014)

HS4015 Health and Safety: Impacts of Dog Related Incidents (Substantive)

1. **Several commenters believe that off leash dogs are a general nuisance to wildlife, habitat, and other Golden Gate National Recreation Area visitors; however, many commenters presented details in the ways dog are a threat to the safety of others, including knocking people over, biting, growling, barking, intimidating and harassing people, and attacking other dogs and horses.**

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 26 **Comment Id:** 337985 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: In referenced to unleashed areas in federal parks- Any area that allows dogs to be unleashed should not be patrolled by mounted park police officers. It is an accident waiting to happen to allow horses in parks designated for unleashed dogs AND dogs to be under voice control. For everyones safety,including dogs,people,mounted officers & horses,KEEP horses OUT of the parks where you allow off leashed dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Liz D Newman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 112 **Comment Id:** 345830 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: At Ocean Beach, I have been bitten by a dog running off leash. It approached me aggressively while I was jogging. I asked the owner, who was nearby, to get it under control, at which point it leapt at me and bit my arm. I still have a scar. The owner expressed zero regret and took zero responsibility. At Muir Beach, when I go there seeking peace and quiet, on a blanket off to one side, a steady parade of off-leash dogs bounds up, with no respect for the boundary of a blanket, sticking its snout in my face and/or food. Owners sometimes say "no" and the dogs sometimes respond, but there's another dog behaving like this every 5-10 minutes on weekends, making peaceful enjoyment of the beach impossible.

Organization:

Commenter: Peter Schurman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 707 **Comment Id:** 352992 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am greatly concerned about the environmental impacts of off-leash dogs roaming our natural parkland. I have witnessed off-leash dogs chasing birds and other wild animals along our beaches and trails. I have also seen off-leash dogs chase runners, jump up on children and attack other dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4694 **Comment Id:** 361346 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I am a dog owner but am made to feel unsafe by other dogs that are off leash. My dog was attacked by three off leash Great Danes. The financial cost of seven surgeries required for her survival was $10,000. My anxiety remains. Off leash dogs are unsafe. They should all be leashed except for fenced dog run areas.

Organization:

Commenter: Sharon A Starr **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5403 **Comment Id:** 363175 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off-leash dogs at the GGNRA have harmed park visitors. Off-leash dogs have been involved in many dog fights and dog bites at the GGNRA. Off-leash dogs have been injured at the GGNRA falling off steep cliffs. Charging and growling off-leash dogs frighten visitors and hamper their ability to enjoy the GGNRA. Running dogs off-leash at the GGNRA puts the welfare of wildlife at great risk. Off-leash dogs are more likely to leave behind dog feces in the park, reducing the recreational value of the GGNRA

Organization:

Commenter: Eddie Bartley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6548 **Comment Id:** 368850 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I've written to you in the past detailing 2 injuries I sustained due to off leash dogs. One injury left me w / a labral tear of my hip, fractured hand and torn abdominal muscles and I was unable to work for 5 months. The second injury happened when a "friendly" high spirited dog lunged at me and it's claw drew blood all the way down my leg. Over the past several years, I've watched as dog owners took over Crissy Field with little intervention by the Park Police to enforce existing leash laws because they are scared of confrontation w / dog owners. Active people like myself fear being hit by a pack of dogs running off leash at high rates of speed; I can't imagine what would happen to the elderly or the very young should they be caught in the path of such unrestrained force. The worst are the dog walkers who bring down 8-10 dogs at a time to run and somehow believe they are in control.

Organization:

Commenter: Pamela Aden **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6678 **Comment Id:** 369611 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Over the last few yeai-s there have been numerous accounts of dogs negatively impacting visitor experiences. A woman visiting Crissy Field reported that her five year old son was attacked by a dog, which also gouged the leg of another child, and complained that other dogs were harassing small children in the area(2); a park visitor at Ocean Beach reported a dog

being attacked by three off leash dogs(3); a hang glider at Fort Funston was bitten by an off-leash dog (4); and an offleash dog harassed a guard on horse patrol to the point of having to be pepper sprayed(5). These are just a few examples of the conflicts that can occur with off-leash dogs.

Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Commenter: Laura Horton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

2. Many commenters described dog owners and commercial dog walkers as dismissive and argumentative. Commenters are concerned about the sense of entitlement that the dog walkers and owners show when their dogs are harassing other visitors.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 368 **Comment Id:** 351270 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: . Now I go to the beach at Fort Funston (of Pacifica Park, take your life at risk) to enjoy the sun, sand water I've some intense experiences where I feared my bare legs would be ripped apart. Most dog owners are responsible but there are enough that are surley, inattentive on their cell phones consider my fears cries for help an inconvenience at best. When a dog is aggressively coming forward, barking incessantly, showing his teeth nipping at my clothes - I have good reason to be afraid. Packs of dogs are the worst. But one horrible time a woman was there with her boyfriends dog for fifteen minutes the dog was running rapid circles around me with her between me the dog as he fiercely growled showed his teeth. Panicked I yelled he wants to bite she said No he just wants to harm me, I'm not sure what the difference is. Finally I took refuge in a tall hefty guy walking down the beach. Suddenly the dog calmed down. The woman told me this was a rescue dog with fierce instincts to protect her.

Organization:

Commenter: Sandi Sinll **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 795 **Comment Id:** 353302 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: To someone who has been attacked, being approached by a group of unleashed dogs and a single human (often off in the distance somewhere) can be a terrifying experience. Having been in this situation I can assure you that compassionate reactions from dog walkers are rare. Mocking amusement, scoffing at the person's fear, or outright anger and aggression are far more common. Add to this those who are not steady on their feet, such as the elderly, and others who are vulnerable, such as children, and we have a situation where dog owners demanding that all areas be off leash are being extremely selfish.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Tremblay **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4279 **Comment Id:** 362354 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Secondly, I have had large off leash dogs jump up on me and nearly knock me

over while their owner laughs heartily in the distance. I have had dog walkers with 5 dogs, 4 off leash, watch as their growling dog cornered me near the stream on a hillside. When the dog walker called for the dog, he did not come, and I had to scream and pick up a stick, and the dog walker had to physically remove the dog. The trails are becoming dangerous to walk on when owners do not keep their dogs on leash.

Organization:

Commenter: Nancy C Blotter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

3. Several commenters expressed disdain over the large number of off leash dogs that are not under voice control. Several of these commenters have refrained from going to certain areas of the park due to the high numbers of dogs.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 108 **Comment Id:** 343886 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Many years ago, I used to go regularly to Rodeo Beach. It was my favorite place of relaxation and recreation. At a certain point the number of dogs present increased dramatically. On one occasion, I arrived in the area near the cliffs on the southern end of the main section of beach, to find that the entire beach smelled like dog feces, something I had never noticed prior to this. I lay down where I usually did to relax in the sun. About 10 minutes later a large brown dog came running at high speed directly into me. One of the dogs sharp nails went into my leg, causing a wound which bled for minutes. The owner of the dog was a young man nearby who saw what happened and was very apologetic. In retrospect it made no difference whether the owner was nice or not - the over enthusiasm of a dog of this sort cannot be controlled. The bad smell and injury caused me to leave. I went to the ranger's office and spoke with a ranger, complaining that dogs were ruining the beach and that I had been injured. He said large numbers of dog owners brought their dogs there because it was one of the few beaches where they were allowed to do so, and he suggested I send a comment to the managers. I have never returned to Rodeo Beach, and as long as dogs are allowed there with their attendant dangers and stink, I will not return. I have recommended to others that they not go there - the place smells polluted with feces and the dogs are dangerous. THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM in these negotiations is that EVERYBODY, including dog owners, knows there is no way to have an arrangement of any type which is safe and sanitary for human visitors, as long as dogs and humans are allowed to be in the same place at the same time.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

4. Many commenters are concerned about the impact that unruly dogs will have on small children. Being jumped on or knocked over has instilled fear of dogs in the children of several commenters. Other commenters expressed concern over the amount of damage dogs can inflict if they were to bite a young child.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 54 **Comment Id:** 338926 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I was a former dog owner - and though I love dogs; it just is not safe for young

children. A large dog can run 15-40 mph chasing after a ball launcher. That's a large impact on a child, scratching them, running over them and hurting them. My children are now afraid of dogs; and they shouldnt be. The sanitation is also a large issue. When you have many dogs, how in the world will you be able to keep track of all the dog feces if your 6-8 dogs are running in every direction.

Organization:

Commenter: Elizabeth K Le **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 957 **Comment Id:** 353828 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have a 2-year-old who loves hiking on his own. We go to GGNRA areas frequently, but lately there have been several incidents where we were walking and without warning an off-leash dog has come bounding up to my son, jumping on him or stomping on him or just surprising him before I could make an appropriate doggy introduction or pick him up out of reach- -while the dog's owner has ineffectually shouted "he's very friendly!" from far away. I have tried to downplay the incidents in my son's mind, but the result is that now he is scared of all dogs and runs screaming from them. (I hate to think if any of these dogs had actually been unfriendly or aggressive toward him!) If there is an area where off-leash dogs and children are both present, the dogs always win, and the children always lose (from incidents where dogs scare/injure children to dog poop that hasn't been picked up). There needs to be a balance of uses.

Organization:

Commenter: Eliza K Jewett-Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

5. Some commenters belive that the visitors of Golden Gate National Recreation Area have learned to coexist, stating that incidents are very rare.

Representative Quotes

Correspondence Id: 5312 **Comment Id:** 362950 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In all that time and on all those occasions there have been very few encounters (I can count them on the fingers of one hand) with other park users who have problems with off leash dogs. Instead all the different types of folks I've encountered on the trail seem to have learned to get along with one another, especially after it became evident that, due to funding cuts everywhere, there's no authority figure they can run to with their problems

Organization:

Commenter: Jim W Stockinger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OTHER COMMENTS

Correspondence Id: 30 **Comment Id:** 337991 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I strongly support leash only on baker beach as this is an area where I have noticed a number of conflict between dogs and wildlife or dog owners and other park visitors. I believe if this area were enforced as leash only this would significantly decrease the tension between dog walkers and other park visitors.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 110 **Comment Id:** 345824 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I have seen good dog owners and bad dog owners. By and large what I have seen is that most owners do not keep their dogs on a leash. When no one else is around that is not a big deal. However, dog owners do not keep vigilant and when the numbers of people start to go up, they do not call their dog to them and leash them up. I have seen senior citizens who have had dogs intimidate them and jump on them. It is not the dogs fault. What I have to ask, and you should as well, if what happens if a elderly citizen is knocked down by a dog? A broken hip on an 75 year old can be a death sentence to that individual. Is a shortened life an acceptable exchange for allowing dog owners to continue with their behavior of not keeping a dog on a fixed leash?

Organization: None

Commenter: James Douglas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 124 **Comment Id:** 346273 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: The incidents have been rare, but over the years I've experienced off-leash dogs acting aggressively towards me, seen one snarl and chase a jogger into a bench, and observed another dog owner have to fend off unwanted attention towards his leashed dog. Creating some separation is a sensible, well thought out move. It will also be nice to enjoy the beach without having to scan for poo-bombs.

Organization:

Commenter: Peter G **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 128 **Comment Id:** 346281 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I am a frequent jogger and hiker (3 times/week) at the sites I will comment on. In summary, I have experienced that only about Â½ of the off-leash dogs I encounter are truly under voice control. Dogs often run after me and occasionally bite me. I am often forced to stop running and ask the owner to get the dog under control. Often they cannot.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 166 **Comment Id:** 349918 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: I have been tripped by dogs while I'm jogging. At 70 years old, tripping and falling is a serious matter! So I fully support the NPS leash plan and restrictions on roaming dogs. I am a dog lover, but we need greater responsibility from dog owners. Leashes are a reasonable restriction and protect us, the wildlife and even other small dogs from harm.
Organization:
Commenter: Robert Barone **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 308 **Comment Id:** 350555 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: As a dog owner and Parent of 3 young children I welcome the enforcement and request dogs on leash at Sutro Park. I have had my young children jumped on and knocked over to the floor by dogs more than 5 times in the past 6 years and I have had to kick unleased dogs off my kids. The part that is most disturbing is that the dog owners don't pay attention to their dogs when they are off leash. Additionaly when I am out with just my dog on a leash other dogs charge us. It is not safe at all for kids and we have a lot more kids now in the neighborhood. We all go to the park at the same time after work dog owners and kids and there is no enforcement officers to provide a safe ennviroment for kids.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 345 **Comment Id:** 350632 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Saturday, Nov 9 around 1030 I was walking (in the direction of the Warming Hut and GGB) across the "wooden bridge" watching the birds below. I stopped (close to the guard rail and bench) to text my son to let him know where I was. A dog, running with a (about 2 ft, I would guess) stick in his mouth, hit me from behind, full speed ahead. The dog (and owner) continued on their run. The back of my leg was gashed, other walkers stopped to my aid. One of them knew of the Emergency Care Center on Scott and Lombard. I spent the rest of the morning and part of the afternoon at Emergency Care, (instead of meeting my son for his birthday celebration). I drove back to Sacramento and he went back to Mt View. The wound required 10 stitches.
Organization:
Commenter: Sharon Klotz **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 355 **Comment Id:** 351006 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Unfortunately, too many dog owners are not responsible owners, especially

those who maintain that their dog does not need a leash because it is under "voice-control." Such dog owners are often hostile and become abusive and threatening toward other park users who object to being approached by unleashed dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 357 **Comment Id:** 351070 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I fully support the GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan (SEIS). The problem of uncontrolled dogs (leashed and unleashed) is an endangerment to people, other living creatures, and vegetation. I've been a life-long walker and, am now, a senior citizen. In the 'leashed dogs only' portion of the San Francisco GGNRA I have been chased, threatened, run into, and tripped by dogs whose owners couldn't or wouldn't control them. Owners of offending dogs were either far away, had no effective 'voice control,' were dismissive of my complaints, or blamed me for their dogs' behavior.

Organization:

Commenter: Jane Church-McDaniel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 367 **Comment Id:** 351268 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Yesterday, I was attacked by a large vicious dog on the Crissy Field beach. I almost went to the hospital and instead saw my doctor. I am very, very upset and scared. This was the second time I have walked on the beach in quite a while, out of fear because of past incidents, and now I will not do it again. I am 62 years old, well able to walk, but not that strong. I have osteoporosis, so if I fall I am at risk of fractures

Organization:

Commenter: Robert Rosiner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1180 **Comment Id:** 351926 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dog owners say that the problem is limited to a few individual owners dogs that the problem self-corrects. This is nonsense. I was attacked by dogs several times and jumped on dozens and dozens of times. Not once did any other dog owner assist or intervene. And no officer was around. Please protect the needs of people, especially vulnerable populations.

Organization:

Commenter: John Mortimer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1187 **Comment Id:** 351947 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Another concern with free running dogs is (2) lack of control over defecating dogs. The latter point presents health risks for small children and infants playing at Ocean Beach

(and other beaches) not to speak of the intimidating effect of a huge dog on an infant sitting in the sand (we have been victimized in this manner many years ago earning the only but very common response by the owner "he/she (it??) is a friendly dog" (which is only for us but not for the dog owner to decide!).

Organization:

Commenter: Christian Paech **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1353 **Comment Id:** 352388 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In addition, the dogs crap all over the beach (and many owners don't scoop), they chase birds (including threatened species), jump up on people that want nothing to do with them (and have destroyed my headset for my iphone on one occasion when a dog jumped up and clawed my chest), and generally create havoc. Many dog owners are responsible with their pets, but many are not. When I have(courteously) informed some dog owners that their dog was off leash in an on leash area, I have been physically threatened, verbally abused and harassed.

Organization:

Commenter: Steven Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1400 **Comment Id:** 352447 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: It is rarely the case when I don't see off leash dogs running through the new plantings, damaging the work to preserve habitat for endangered species. I have been afraid several times for my safety and that of my son because of pitbull and similar breeds off-leash, as well as other large dogs chasing wildly through the area with their owners far from any ability to curb and control their dogs. I realize there are a number of respectful dog owners, but it only takes one neglectful owner to precipitate a tragedy.

Organization:

Commenter: Summer Lee **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 600 **Comment Id:** 352695 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: PLEASE do not allow professional dog walkers into any GGNRA areas. in the past six months I have been bitten by an OFF LEASH dog being walked by a completely inattentive dog walker, at least 12 OFF LEASH dogs, none of which responded to any voice control. the dog who bit me, hole in the jeans and 6 puncture wounds, a truly vicious dog. and also in the past six months, i was knocked to the ground, on the beach, by several OFF LEASH large dogs, running out of any control, a pack of at least 10, dog walker had no voice control whatsoever. seniors are especially vulnerable to these irresponsible dog walkers!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1473 **Comment Id:** 352864 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: i was bitten on the leg while i was walking my dog - who was leashed - by a dog who was not on a leash and decided to attack out of the blue. the owner could not control her dog and as i tried to get her dog away from mine i was bitten. the owner stood and screamed and felt somehow that that was her contribution to controlling her out of control dog. certainly this situation could have been if not alleviated, at least less problematic had her dog been leashed.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1511 **Comment Id:** 352961 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have no problem with dogs, we love small pets. However, in public places, unleashed dogs should be avoided. On Pacifica beach a dog attacked my wife, threw her on ground and climbed on top of her while she was shouting keep the dog away. The owner of the dog lady just stood there and saying.. "oh, he is just playing with you, he is very gentle and very friendly"

Organization:

Commenter: alok kumar **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 728 **Comment Id:** 353060 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Along with fellow residents of our home for the elderly, I walk Crissy Field in the early morning hours of Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. One of our fellow walkers, Norma Chan, no longer walks with us since she fell on the path after having been knocked down by a dog which was not leashed. Several months ago I suffered a dizzying blow to the side of my head from a ball that had been in effect "shot" by a dog's owner who used a wand to send the ball a greater distance for her unleashed dog to chase. This suggests that unleashed dogs present a menace to those who walk Crissy Field, at least during the more heavily traveled daylight hours between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.

Organization: San Francisco Towers

Commenter: gerald d adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 747 **Comment Id:** 353114 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: My wife and I are 85 yrs. old and walk often at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Sigmund Stern Grove. We have no dog, and find often that we are almost the only ones without a pet. We both use canes, walk slowly, and try to enjoy the beauty of our surroundings. 1) We have come close to being knocked over by large dogs chasing each other. 2) We are often annoyed by the loud, shouting voices of the commercial dog walkers calling their tardy "clients".

Organization:

GGNRA161661

Commenter: david p holman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 757 **Comment Id:** 353131 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Off-leash and even on-leash dogs approach me, growl at me, jump up on me, and escalate aggressive behaviors when they see that I'm afraid of them. Dog owners laugh or casually say to me, "Oh don't worry, she doesn't bite," or "He just wants to play, that's his way of being friendly" and then that same dog starts barking in a mean manner or looking like it's going to bite or jumps on me and then the owner looks surprised. By then it's sometimes too late, especially when the dog is close to me and off leash and the owner can't call their dog off successfully. Another recurring problem is collared dogs whose owners are letting them run off leash, while the owners hold the (empty) leash. About half of such owners immediately call their dog back and put it back on the leash long before I get closer; that's great and it's much appreciated. But other owners aren't paying attention and don't act fast enough, or they call their dog back but the dog ignores them and runs toward me barking aggressively. I can't outrun a dog. I'm reluctant, when hiking by myself, to get into an confrontation with a dog owner or challenge them about their dog's behavior or about the rules of the park, especially on a trail where nobody else is in sight. I want to be able to hike in my parks without being afraid of being jumped on, growled at, or bitten by someone's aggressive dog.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4257 **Comment Id:** 353151 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: Last weekend my family, consisting of my spouse and my 19-year-old son, Sam, traveled to Muir Beach to see the recently completed restoration work on Redwood Creek. Sam loves beaches (as do his mother and I) and so a much anticipated secondary purpose of our trip was to take a walk along Muir Beach. However, our trip did not include a beach walk. Why, you may ask, did my family's visit to Muir Beach not include an activity that members of my family greatly enjoy? Let me explain. Sam is afflicted with an autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Like many ASD kids and adults, he has certain sensory sensitivities, aka phobias. One of these sensitivities is triggered by off-leash (but not on-leash) dogs. This sensitivity may stem from a childhood experience in which he was threatened by a dog that he encountered. The point is that this sensitivity exists. At the current time, as GGNRA officials well know, Muir Beach is open to off-leash dog use. On the day of our visit the beach was crowded with off-leash dogs, with little effort that was apparent to us on the part of the owners of these dogs to exert control over or limit in any way the movements of the dogs. (Some public park managers, the EBRPD being the principal case in point, indulge in the fiction that dog owners can successfully be instructed to keep their off-leash dogs "under control.") So the universal presence of off-leash dogs at Muir Beach precluded us from visiting the beach, something we otherwise would most certainly have done. The access exclusion that we experienced constituted a clear and indisputable violation of the GGNRA's obligations under the Americans' With Disabilities Act (ADA) not to discriminate against persons with disabilities in managing the park areas under its jurisdiction. I understand that the revised dog management plan that the GGNRA currently has under consideration will

alleviate at least some of the conditions noted above at Muir Beach and elsewhere. If so I strongly urge its adoption.

Organization:

Commenter: John B Bowers **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1766 **Comment Id:** 353748 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Unfortunately due to some fog owners who careless about others, it is a great initiative to restrain off-leash of dogs in public spaces. I had dog bite my 6 YO and the reply I got was: "nothing I can do about it". Or, stepped more than once on dog feces in the beach or our community park and garden.

Organization:

Commenter: Yoram N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2974 **Comment Id:** 355294 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I actually do not oppose the plan because many dog owners are not responsible when they use parks or public recreation lands with their dogs. It's quite com mon they let the dogs run free. It's hard to go for a walk without being bothered by unleashed dogs. I have been attacked and bitten by free running dogs before when on Ocean Beach.

Organization: DogPAC of San Francisco

Commenter: Alan Hightman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2058 **Comment Id:** 355607 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: I like to hike in the GG National Recreation Area. I have been aggressively approached by large off-leash dogs on several occasions. I object to this. I have been bit by dogs and object to them approaching me. I object to being made afraid by the simple act of taking a hike. It's my strong opinion that dog owners should compromise on this issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Bob Frost **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6657 **Comment Id:** 357110 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I love close to where Pacifica Police had to shoot a pit bull who killed his pregnant owner. The dog was allowed to sleep in his owners bed and was thought of as "one of the family". It was allowed to run off leash at Mori Pt and on the beach. It could have killed someone else as easily as it killed its owner. Children and everyone else deserve to be safe from clueless dog owners like this one.

Organization:

Commenter: Julia Thomas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2293 **Comment Id:** 357648 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Every time I visit a park in the San Francisco area, regardless of policy, I find that owners tend to have their dogs off-leash, for better or worse. The danger of people shirking policy is that the bad dog owners win. Those who are okay potentially endangering the safety of children or other animals are the ones who will begin to dominate our parks and those who are looking for a safe and managed space to let their dogs off-leash will have no where to go. This not only endangers the lives of people but also infringes upon the rights of those dog owners who do effectively manage and clean up after their pets. The people who should be impacted by this are not the ones making use of approved spaces but those who do not make use of those spaces.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3027 **Comment Id:** 357717 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I'm a frequent user of the trails near my house, both hiking and biking and have been bitten (I've filed a report with Park police) chased, and lunged at too many times to count. I now carrying pepper spray because I fear all the off leash dogs that gather around Alta trail (as many as 40 if not more most days)

Organization:

Commenter: Serena Dugan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2410 **Comment Id:** 358909 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI

Comment Text: Dogs need to be on leash in public areas, period. I have been attacked when on my bicycle just minding my own business and the owner said, "He was just wanting to play with you". My child has been knocked down by a "he's a good dog, he would never hurt anyone". A large portion of dog owners do not pick after their defecating animals.

Organization:

Commenter: Eric H **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3611 **Comment Id:** 359257 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Time and time again, I see dogs off leash in places where they are supposed to be on leash. I have learned that "under voice control" is a fictional state. I have seen plastic bags of dog poop scattered along trails. I have encountered dog owners who aggressively insist on their rights to break the rules. A friend of mine broke his hip after an off-leash dog ran in front of his bicycle on the Railroad Grade. The dog owners ran off.

Organization: self

Commenter: Eve Pell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3732 **Comment Id:** 359425 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: It works; there are few issues; 99%+ tors use responsibly; even the NPS statistics support that there is less than one dog related issue per 20,000 visitors.
Organization:
Commenter: Elizabeth V Mooney **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3968 **Comment Id:** 360270 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On the Old San Pedro road trail while riding uphill, I came upon three large German Shepard's - off leash and out of sight of their owners who had sat down for a break around a corner. One bit me on the hand, and one got behind me. The other was barking aggressively. I was so freaked out that I cancelled the rest of my ride and turned around. The teller at the BofA was the one who noticed I was bleeding.
Organization:
Commenter: Mike C **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 3968 **Comment Id:** 360271 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: On the Baquiano trail, just above the Fassler trailhead, I was attacked by two Pit Bulls - Off Leash and out of control of their handler who was holding a baby in her hands. This lady was not even from Pacifica but had heard it was a great place to let the dogs run wild off-leash. And they were her daughters dogs, which explained why this lady had absolutely No Verbal Control while the snapped and barked at me.
Organization:
Commenter: Mike C **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4549 **Comment Id:** 360569 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Last month, a very large labrador approached my two sons who were strapped into their stroller while we were walking down a very busy section of FIllmore Street. It shoved its nose in my son's face. My son pushed him away. This dog was off-leash and the owner casually said "he's friendly." No matter how friendly, dog owners cannot always predict their own dog's reaction, nor can they predict the reaction of a startled toddler who has just been accosted by an uninvited large dog. Prior to that, my 2 year old son has been knocked over by large dogs running off-leash in Julius Khan Park and again INSIDE the gated playground in Alta Plaza Park.
Organization:
Commenter: Rachel Holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4639 **Comment Id:** 361157 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I do not support increasing unleashed dogs in the GGNRA. Despite owners' protests to the contrary, dogs' conduct cannot be predicted with accuracy. Keeping a dog under control by voice commands is unrealistic, uncertain and often unsuccessful. Dogs run into and jump onto others, such as hikers, without warning. People fall and get needlessly hurt. Moreover, people are frightened and intimidated. It is unconscionable to permit this. The enjoyment of dogs or dog owners should not trump the safety rights of other people

Organization:

Commenter: Marc L Sherman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4643 **Comment Id:** 361163 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: We have lived in San Francisco for many years and can share the numerous encounters we have had with irresponsible dog owners who assume we want their unleashed animals jumping on us or our personal property in public places before we have to alert the owners of our allergies. Most often the response from dog owners is surprisingly not an apology but rather an indication that they are entitled to do what they wish even to the detriment of other persons.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4707 **Comment Id:** 361361 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I would prefer to see dogs that stay on leash at all times unless there is a dog run. They should be kept away from areas that ordinary citizens enjoy and away from children because you never know if a dog could turn on child or person and bite or maul them. There have been cases where children have been attacked by dogs and as a parent you can never know if a dog will be ok around a child.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4842 **Comment Id:** 361623 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I have never heard of a dog bite at Chrissy Field and in the many visits, I have not witnessed any dog aggression.

Organization:

Commenter: Susan Baranowski **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5110 **Comment Id:** 362194 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Off-leash dogs in these areas pose no danger; a tiny minority of irresponsible guardians is to blame for any issues that arise. Deal with them, and you will eliminate any safety issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Lauren Hauptman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5231 **Comment Id:** 362739 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: In my experience, voice and sight control is not a form of control that a person, such as myself, who doesn't like to be approached, jumped on, barked at in very close range, or otherwise harassed by unknown dogs can count on. A person walking on the beach has no way of knowing which dogs on voice control are really on voice control and which are simply running around without leashes. As an example, while I was walking, an unleashed dog, which appeared to be part pit bull, ran out of the dunes, coming to a halt about 2 feet from me. For about a minute, it stood there, barking and growling and looking at me in a threatening manner. I froze, my heart racing, looking in vain for someone whose voice would control this dog and get it away from me, but there was no one in the vicinity. Eventually the dog ran beyond me toward the ocean and I was able to continue on. In a minute, two people, who appeared to be looking for and calling a dog by name, came out of the dunes. I asked them if they were looking for a dog of this dog's description. When they said they were, and I told them about the encounter I had with this dog, they told me that was impossible, that their dog had never threatened anyone, etc. and they accused me of threatening their dog!

Organization:

Commenter: Joan Sprinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5304 **Comment Id:** 362930 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Dogs create conflicts, between off leash dogs that attack each other to dogs that attack humans or knock over children. I had a dog until recently, and we plan to get another. Our dog was attacked by off-leash dogs a few times on separate trails in Mill Valley.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5391 **Comment Id:** 363042 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Many favorite trails are now overrun with off leash dogs that are not command responsive or may respond "sometimes". When chasing rabbits or squirrels or birds, commands are ignored by the majority of canines. These trails are no longer pleasant and instead intimidating, as one never knows when they will encounter an animal that is often wary and nervous. Dog fights on trails are not uncommon, likely due to nervous or territorial dogs.

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon

Commenter: Leora Feeney **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5450 **Comment Id:** 363302 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Several times being approached by a vicious appearing dog, yelling at the owner to call it off, not knowing if my leg is about to bit off. Owner far away or looking at me like something is wrong with me, not with the dog. Or the frequent remark: "oh, he's really a friendly dog, never hurt anbody".
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5488 **Comment Id:** 363353 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: We have NEVER had any issue with our dog, anyone else's dog, nor any other recreational users. We are always respectful of the rules and other's space.
Organization:
Commenter: Jennifer Palmer **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5578 **Comment Id:** 363960 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I take my 3 pound Chihuahua for walks through Fort Funston and have never encountered any problems with other off leash dogs or owners. I have found the community to be considerate of eachother and of the area. We respect the site and treasure the opportunity to have this location. I feel safer today on my walks at Fort Funston than I did in years past when fewer people where there. Please dont change it.
Organization:
Commenter: Catherine Pacheco **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5627 **Comment Id:** 364029 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: In fourteen years of visiting Fort Funston with our dogs several times a month, we have never seen any significant unpleasant incident regarding dogs. What we have seen is the occasional unpleasant tangle of peoples' legs from leashes in use in this constrained pathway.
Organization:
Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5632 **Comment Id:** 364048 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Dogs frighten off wildlife in the park. They chase birds. They are the only park 'visitors' that routinely defecate and urinate in the park. They bite people! Children who are at face level with most of the dogs in the park are at risk from dog attacks while playing in the park.

Dogs bark. The tranquility of a day in the park is disturbed by the presence of dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: georgina j monahan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5737 **Comment Id:** 364202 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: If it weren't for the bad behavior of some dog owners and canines that can not be controlled, I would be opposed to the banning of dogs to the proposed areas. I have seen children feeling threatened by dogs and dogs chasing birds. It is reasonable to regulate access to dogs in National Parks. Please implement the plan. It is thoughtful and protective.

Organization:

Commenter: Piper Cafferata **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5777 **Comment Id:** 364286 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: On countless occasions, owners have let dogs contaminate waterways by not picking up feces; have actively ignored posted signs pertaining to presence of endangered species; and have created situations in which both humans and dogs could be injured. When a dog is off-leash, it is unknown to the general public whether the animal will or will not listen to voice commands or if the animal is in fact of a more peaceful demeanor or not.

Organization: Concerned Citizen

Commenter: Andy Keller **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5848 **Comment Id:** 364398 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: As a father of two young boys living in the city, I get very frustrated by how a city of people is over run by dog owners and dogs who have abused the lack of signage to allow all sized dogs to run free without a leash. Many times a week when one approaches my kids, I am told 'he is friendly'. That doesn't matter to me...maybe my 1 year old isn't friendly because he hasn't spent a lot of time with an 80 lb lab and will poke him in the eye because the dog is pushing his mouth in my sons face; and who knows how friendly that un leashed dog will then be? I have been biten and harassed by all kinds of "friendly" dogs.

Organization:

Commenter: Ben holbrook **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5851 **Comment Id:** 364403 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: When children (often 2-4 years old) are attacked by dogs, the resulting lacerations (often on the face) are often large and deep and leave scars; they can lead to serious infections. In the worst case, dog attacks can be fatal, as happened years ago here in an infamous and gruesome case.

Organization:
Commenter: Nima Afshar **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5905 **Comment Id:** 364511 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I am an avid runner and have had several incidents with dogs including being chased, scratched, and nearly bitten on three different occasions. This has happened along crissy field, baker beach, batteries to bluffs, and throughout the presidio. The reactions from these dog owners has varied from apologetic, to laughing, to outright hostile and confrontational. The last being an incident involving a young man with a large male pit bull off- leash which I reported to the park police. The situation has become so bad that I have resorted to carrying dog spray while running. Although these incidents have been rare, they have the capability of resulting in grave bodily harm or even death.
Organization:
Commenter: Kavan G Manson **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 5991 **Comment Id:** 364869 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: have been going to Fort Funston almost weekly ever since we got our dog, and it is the happiest we ever see him. It is great for all the dogs to run free, and play and swim, and we have never had a bad experience with other dogs, or witnessed a bad person/dog interaction.
Organization:
Commenter: Chris Finegold **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6040 **Comment Id:** 365020 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: There's not enough off leash areas as it is & if people without dogs want an area to go - there are MANY places already for them & if people are afraid of dogs - they should go to those areas NOT designed & set aside for Dogs. Sure, there have been a few complaints & problems but there's no perfect place. I think it's important to remember that the number of complaints about people (visitors) out weigh those about dogs.
Organization:
Commenter: hannah j st. martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4411 **Comment Id:** 365157 **Coder Name:** JEMATKOWSKI
Comment Text: My toddler was knocked down by a large unleashed dog at Crissy field and developed a fear of dogs that lasted years. There are too many places in the park where a family cannot sit down with young children or food and be safe from invading dogs. The alarming sight of uncontrolled dogs running down shorebirds and horses must stop.
Organization:

Commenter: Gloria Koch **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6114 **Comment Id:** 365440 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have also had the extremely unpleasant experience of having to stop, start, stop, wheel my car around in order to avoid dogs which were not on leashes. After endangering my life in order to save the life of a little dog running loose in a parking lot or in the middle of a street adjacent to a park, the owners appear and tell me that the dog is under "voice control." This is simply insane. Each time this happened, the owner would be calling and calling while the dog, either confused and lost or over excited by the traffic and running, just kept running away from the owner. In both cases, if I had not had great reflexes the dogs and possibly the owners would have been smashed.
Organization:
Commenter: Leslie J Friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6138 **Comment Id:** 365595 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: Thank you for restricting dogs in Chrissy field. I am an elderly lady who enjoys walking on the beach, but I am afraid of being knocked down by the large dogs running around on the beach. They are unpredictable and often out of control. Their owners are not able to control them. Thank you for preserving the beaches for people!
Organization:
Commenter: Allison N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6229 **Comment Id:** 366147 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I have never seen (and I can't even remember hearing) of any problems caused by the presence of dogs on or off-leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Jay Kammen **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6235 **Comment Id:** 366153 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN
Comment Text: I bring my dog here almost every day and the dogs here all seem to get along, and I have never had an issue with "dog-violence" or any other problem due to animals not being on a leash.
Organization:
Commenter: Scott Rooker **Page:** **Paragraph:**
Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6277 **Comment Id:** 366397 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Even though most of the dogs are well behaved and are voice controlled it is common, almost daily, to observe dogs that are totally out of control; dogs chasing and fighting with other dogs, chasing after other walkers and bicyclist, nipping or biting people (this even happened to me as I walked to my office), and much more. And, it's not just the dogs but also the owners who don't pick up after their dogs, or if they do they leave the plastic bags lay on the ground for someone else to pick up. How is any of this considerate for others.

Organization:

Commenter: Fred Picavet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6299 **Comment Id:** 366475 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: I hope strict ON LEASH laws are passed. For the sake of people with children. These Off leash areas are unsafe. Animals are unpredictable We became aware of this when our 4 year old Was bit by a pit bill this year.

Organization: Mom in PAC heights

Commenter: Tami N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6621 **Comment Id:** 367470 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Though unfortunate, negative situations will occur but are almost always covered by specific regulations that are broken by careless dog owners. To apply a blanket restriction because of a few scofflaws is inappropriate.

Organization:

Commenter: Dixon Power **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6648 **Comment Id:** 368222 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: At Fort Funston, I've often seen dog walkers with several dogs, frequently off leash, disturbing, even frightening other visitors, and in two instances causing injury! This aside from environmental damage they are causing.

Organization:

Commenter: Jim Morrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6631 **Comment Id:** 368384 **Coder Name:** K_CCHIPMAN

Comment Text: Visitors with children feel that their childs safety is threatened because in fact their childs safety is threatened. The issue with the safety of children is not just a perception of visitors, it is an established fact. This fact is almost completely ignored in the SEIS. It should be noted that although there is a considerable literature on the especial risks of dogs attacking children, there is little literature on other groups that may be similarly vulnerable, including the